

Analysis of Prospective Science Teachers' Level of Knowledge about Thermodynamics and Their Reasoning with Daily Life

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to determine the relationships that prospective science teachers have established between thermodynamics and environmental problems. The study was conducted with the case study method. The sample consisted of 74 senior prospective science teachers selected by purposive sampling and studied in Science Teaching Department in the faculty of education of a state university in Turkey in the spring semester of the 2018-2019 academic year. The data collection tool consisted of two parts: The first part included four open-ended questions, and it was the questionnaire in which the prospective science teachers were asked to explain the laws of thermodynamics. In the second part, eleven open-ended questions were expected to be explained the given environmental problems by the laws of thermodynamics. As a result of the study, prospective science teachers were found to have difficulty applying thermodynamics laws to a daily event or environmental problem.

Keywords

environmental problems, laws of thermodynamics, prospective science teachers, teaching thermodynamics.

1. Introduction

The industrialization movements that started in the 19th century worldwide brought many environmental problems (EPs) such as global warming, air pollution, water pollution. Since these EPs are becoming a more significant concern, some precautions should be taken to prevent EPs. Undoubtedly, one of the most basic precautions is educating the individuals to eliminate EPs (Kahyaoğlu, 2009). For this purpose, in

Turkey, environmental education starts from pre-school to university in formal education institutions in a considerable period. However, studies have shown that individuals still have not achieved the desired level of environmental awareness (Yücel & Morgil, 1998). Although legal regulations have been prepared as a caution to prevent EPs according to Kahyaoğlu (2009), EPs are not only a problem that law can solve. It is essential to change the behaviors of the individual to avoid EPs. The attitude and value judgments of the individual are essential in changing behaviors. Therefore, individuals' positive attitude towards the environment can be effective in reducing people's role in the occurrence of EPs. On the other hand, energy issues in nature are one of the factors triggering EPs (Kırtak, 2010).

Since all events in nature can be explained by energy transfer or transformation (Mansson & McGlade, 1993), it is clear from this perspective that EPs will never end completely. Thermodynamics, besides, is an interdisciplinary subject of physics, chemistry, and biological sciences since it is an area related to heat exchange and energy. There are very few educational studies in which the relationship between thermodynamics and the environment is established. Therefore, this study, which approaches thermodynamic and environmental problems from a different perspective, is considered the basis for further research. Literature Review

The studies on thermodynamics have revealed that a significant part of these studies is conducted for concept teaching. In these studies, it is seen that in addition to collecting qualitative and quantitative data, applications are made to identify misconceptions and to eliminate these misconceptions (Bain, Moon, Mack & Towns, 2014; Harrison, Grayson & Treagust, 1999).

1 Due to the confusion of heat and energy concepts, students often have difficulty
2 learning thermodynamics (Cotignola, Bordogna, Punte & Cappannini, 2002; Harrison et
3 al., 1999), and it is also inevitable that they have misconceptions. However, the number
4 of studies on thermodynamics in education is limited (Baran & Sözbilir, 2018; Tanel,
5 2006; Tatar & Oktay, 2011).

6 Sreenivasulu and Subramaniam (2013) conducted their studies on
7 thermodynamics with 106 university graduates of the chemistry department. The study
8 aimed to find out the understanding of thermodynamics by graduate students through a
9 four-stage test. The results of this study reiterated that thermodynamics was a science full
10 of conceptual difficulties and alternative understandings. Loverude, Kautz, and Heron
11 (2002) conducted a study with a group of physics students from the first and second-grade
12 students of the university and tried to reveal the students' understanding of the 1st law of
13 thermodynamics (1.LoTD). They found that students frequently failed to differentiate the
14 concepts of heat, temperature, work, and internal energy. Thomas and Schwenz (1998)
15 found that they had many misconceptions about thermodynamics in their studies with
16 4th-grade chemistry students. Klimenko (2012), in his study with engineering students,
17 found that the 1.LoTD was not difficult for the students, but they had difficulty in
18 understanding the concepts of entropy with the 2.LoTD and 3.LoTD. Similarly, Sözbilir
19 (2004) found that students had misconceptions about thermodynamics and entropy.

20 The concept of entropy is seen to be the subject of joint studies on
21 thermodynamics and the environment. Many EPs in nature can be explained by the
22 increase of entropy (Kırtak, 2010) because all the changes in our environment are
23 irreversible processes (Smith, 2001). For example, the concentration of energy resources
24 in the underground is an example of a high entropy situation, while burning fossil energy

sources and giving CO₂ to the atmosphere is a low entropy situation. Sözbilir, and Bennett (2007), in their study of university students taking the course of physical chemistry can explain the concept of entropy with disorder, and they found that students often had the wrong information and they saw the concept of entropy as equivalent to confusion. Ribeiro (1992) also reached similar conclusions and found that the concept of entropy was equivalent to chaos and disorder.

One of the studies in which thermodynamics is related to the environment or EPs belongs to Tokuya, Yamamoto, and Takashi (2004). They investigated that how high school and university students associated environmental issues to physics. As a result of the study, it was found that the majority of university students did not remember the LoTD existing in environmental issues, and they were not aware that high school and university students could have explained many phenomena in nature with the laws of physics they had learned before. Öztaş (2005), on the other hand, applied an open-ended questionnaire to 135 students in the ninth grade to investigate the extent to which students could adapt their knowledge about LoTD to ecological systems. At the end of the study, it was seen that students could not have established a relationship between conservation of matter and matter cycle and energy conversion. He also found that the students did not consider LoTD and could not have applied LoTD to ecological events. Kirtak-Ad and Demirci (2012) investigated the level of the relationship between LoTD and EPs of 245 physics, chemistry, and prospective biology teachers in their studies. As a result of the study, prospective teachers could not have established a relationship between thermodynamics and EPs in terms of energy pollution (Nuclear power plants, radioactive material residues, environmental pollution caused by nuclear weapons producing factories are defined as energy pollution) and thermal pollution (Thermal pollution is the deterioration of the

quality of the water by any operation that changes the temperature of the environmental water). They were found to have difficulty in applying the LoTD to EPs.

It is crucial to identify misconceptions for better teaching, as well as how these concepts are applied to everyday events because the actual learning begins with the adaptation of what students have learned to different events or with explaining the daily events by the information they have learned (Coştu, Ünal & Ayas, 2007). The connection of LoTD with the environment is also essential in this respect. As mentioned above, unfortunately, there are very few educational studies in which thermodynamics and environment are associated. Therefore, this study, which is based on thermodynamics and EPs' association, is expected to shed light on the following research. From this point of view, this study aims to determine the relationship between EPs and LoTD of the prospective science teachers (PSTs). For this purpose, the following research problems were sought:

- What is the level of knowledge of the prospective science teachers about laws of thermodynamics?
- How do the prospective science teachers make environmental reasoning problems with laws of thermodynamics?

2. Method

2.1. Research Design and Sample

This study was carried out with the case study method, which is one of the qualitative research approaches. A case study is a research method that provides a portrait of what this phenomenon is like (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007; Yin, 2003),

conducting an in-depth study and comparing the data according to particular circumstances (Patton 1990).

The sample selected by using purposive sampling and consisted of 74 senior prospective science teachers (PSTs) (48 females, 26 males, and aged 23-24) in the Science Teaching Department in a faculty of education of a state university in Turkey in the spring semester of 2018-2019 academic year. PSTs gained information about LoTD in the "Physics-III" course (The topics: Thermodynamics: Heat and temperature, Thermal properties of matter (Specific heat, thermal conductivity, thermal expansion), Thermodynamic laws, reversible and irreversible events, efficiency and entropy), and environmental issues in "Environmental Science (The topics: Water, Soil, Air, Radioactive pollution and other sources of pollution)" and "Special Topics in Chemistry (The topics: Air pollution, Greenhouse gases, and their importance, Water pollution, Environment, and environmental problems in the light of chemistry, Chemical pollution, Nuclear Energy)" courses at different semesters.

2.2. Data Collection Tools

The questionnaire used as a data collection tool can be examined under two parts. These parts are introduced below:

- In the first part of the questionnaire, there are four open-ended questions in which PSTs are asked to explain the meaning of the LoTD.
- In the second part of the questionnaire, there are eleven open-ended questions which are expected to explain by the LoTD of the given EPs.

In the questionnaire development phase, the opinions of three experts who completed their PhD in physics and chemistry education and science education were taken.

2.3. Data Collection Process

The data collection process took two weeks. There was no time limitation while the PSTs were completing the questionnaire, and the PSTs were released on time. In the first week, the first part of the questionnaire tool was applied to the PSTs for approximately one hour. The second week took 60-70 minutes for the PSTs to complete the second part of the questionnaire.

2.4. Data Analysis

In the first part of the questionnaire, the data obtained from open-ended questions about LoTD were analyzed through content analysis. For the second part of the questionnaire, an answer key was created by asking six physics and chemistry experts to answer the questions. Information about the experts whose opinions were included in the study is presented in Table 1.

Table 1 Some information about the experts whose opinions were included in the study

Science Experts		
Title	Field of Expertise	Experience
Associate Professor	Physical Chemistry	25 years
Associate Professor	Biochemistry	15 years
Associate Professor	Solid State Physics	14 years
Associate Professor	Atom and Molecule	14 years
Associate Professor	Atom and Molecule	9 years
PhD	Solid State Physics	10 years
Language Experts		
Title	Field of Expertise	Experience
PhD	Language and Literature	18 years

The answers of the PSTs were analyzed with understanding levels in Table 2 that Abraham, Williamson put forward, and Westbrook (1994) and these understanding levels are used in some recent studies such as Çalık and Cobern (2017) and Yaman, Ayas, and Çalık (2019). The understanding levels used in these studies were slightly arranged in this study to avoid confusion. A limited understanding level (LU) was added. The answer key

- 1 prepared based on the experts' opinions and the understanding levels shown in Table 2
- 2 was used in the analysis of the data.

3 **Table 2** Understanding levels and explanations of the levels

Understanding levels	Abbreviation	Explanations of the understanding levels	Example explanations of 2nd question for the understanding levels (Q2: Is it possible for a gasoline automobile's engine (internal combustion engines) to operate at 100% energy efficiency? Explain the reasons.)
No understanding	[NU]	Unclear, incomprehensible answers and the answers are left blank.	Exhaust fumes cause air pollution (PST20)
Misunderstanding	[MU]	Answers containing misconceptions and/or incorrect information.	If we call the gas-powered car 80% efficient, the gasoline could be 100% (PST14)
Partial understanding	[PU]	Answers containing correct information at the basic level (short answers, giving examples, etc.).	It is not possible normally. But it is possible if they can remove the friction force (PST10)
Limited understanding	[LU]	Answers containing no misconceptions and incorrect information, answers with acceptable information.	Not possible because losses will occur during energy conversions (PST 52)
Sound understanding	[SU]	Complete and accurate answers.	It cannot work in 100% efficiency. Heat will be released and entropy will increase. It concerns the second LoTD. In addition, energy cannot be created or destroyed, there is only conversion of energy (PST25)

- 4
- 5 While quoting the statements of the PSTs, they were coded as PST1, PST2,
- 6 PST3,..., PST74. If the PSTs answered sequentially, the coding was shortened by placing
- 7 ""-"" between the numbers in the code (for example, instead of showing in this way PST1,
- 8 2, 3, 4, 5, it is shown as PST1-5).

2.5. Validity and Reliability of the Study

Before the data collection process, the researchers informed the PSTs that "these activities and data would not constitute any assessment for your courses," "applications and data would be used for research purposes only," and "no information would be shared with study readers except for some demographic information." Besides, PSTs were informed about the content of the study. All ethical responsibilities were considered, and informed consent was taken from PSTs. The purpose of this information is to increase the credibility of the study by enabling PSTs to respond comfortably and sincerely during the data collection process.

To increase the study's credibility and consistency, the necessary reductions (unnecessary words were omitted) were made three different times by the researchers, and the critical answers were determined. Then, some codes were created according to the PSTs answers. These codes were divided into appropriate themes/categories. Expert opinions ensured the validity and reliability of these stages.

The second part of the data collection tool was evaluated according to the understanding levels prepared by the researchers. However, it was considered that this would not have brought very objective and accurate results to ensure the reliability of the comparative agreement between the two evaluators. A different field education expert was asked to evaluate the data. The expert also grouped the data obtained from the first part of the data collection tools, and he placed the answers under the appropriate themes. Afterward, the total agreement with the researchers' answers was calculated by using the IBM SPSS v22 package program by calculating the Cohen's Kappa value between the two readers. The calculated Cohen's Kappa (κ) was found to be 0.915, and it was found

1 that almost perfect agreement was achieved according to Landis and Koch's (1977)
2 classifications. After this stage, the researchers evaluated the second part of the form.

3 Besides, the data collection process was carried out in the classroom where an
4 environment researchers were accustomed to, and thus, it had been tried to increase the
5 study's credibility. Transferability is another criterion used in qualitative research instead
6 of generalization (Miles & Huberman, 1994). In qualitative researches, research results
7 can be transferred to similar situations rather than the generalization of them (Yıldırım &
8 Şimşek, 2011). In this study, to increase the transferability, the data obtained during the
9 research process are presented to the reader in the findings section without commenting
10 on them and preserving the data's nature and organized under the themes and categories
11 where necessary. In this way, the reader will be able to reach conclusions about the
12 research situation more clearly and get the opportunity to transfer them to other research
13 situations. The results of the research should be supported by the data (Miles &
14 Huberman, 1994). This is an indicator of the verifiability of the data. In this research, the
15 direct statements of the participants were given for the verification of the data.

16 Another critical point in ensuring the validity and reliability of the study is the
17 position of the researchers. Researchers are faculty members that the PSTs see for four
18 years and conduct the PSTs' lessons from time to time. This situation provided the
19 opportunity to overcome the lack of long-term participation in the study.

20 As a final point, because the education language is Turkish, the implementation
21 was carried out in Turkish, the questions were asked in Turkish, and then they were all
22 translated into English. An English language lecturer had controlled the translations.

3. Results

The data shown in the findings section are grouped under two headings: (1) The data relating to the knowledge levels of the PSTs about the LoTD are presented under the first heading. (2) The findings obtained from the explanations made by the PSTs by reasoning EPs with LoTD are presented under the second heading.

3.1. Findings from the Analysis of Data Related to the Knowledge Levels of the PSTs about LoTD

The findings of the data that the PSTs explained their LoTD are presented in the following tables. Tables 3-6 show the coded statements, and some PSTs' statements (the most remarkable ones) were given the related table afterward. Table 3 shows the explanations of the PSTs about the zeroth LoTD. The first question was: How do you explain the zeroth law of thermodynamics?

Table 3 Explanations of the PSTs about the zeroth LoTD

Answers	Prospective Science Teacher	<i>f</i>
All three materials in the same environment have the same heat energy, thermal equilibrium. If A = B and A = C then B = C.	PST5, 10-11, 15-17, 23, 25-26, 29, 31, 36, 40, 44, 48, 52, 56, 67-72	23
It is that the substances are at equal temperature. This is the absence of heat exchange.	PST24, 27, 37, 41, 43, 47, 50, 54-55, 57, 60-61	12
Energy cannot be created or destroyed. Only the transformation takes place.	PST4, 7, 19, 39, 42, 74	6
The energy of a working system is never zero.	PST45, 53, 62	3
It is the balance of temperature.	PST58, 63	2
It is the basic balance of systems.	PST51, 59	2
It is the conservation of heat.	PST8, 22	2
Between two objects of different temperatures, heat energy is transferred from the hot object to the cold one.	PST35	1
Chemical and physical events.	PST65	1
Temperature protection.	PST49	1
The absence of heat exchange between the same objects.	PST66	1
The temperature is below zero.	PST20	1

No description.	PST1-3, 6, 9, 12-14, 18, 21, 28, 30, 32-34, 38, 46, 64, 73	19
-----------------	--	----

According to Table 3, most of the PSTs explained the zeroth LoTD as "If $A = B$ and $A = C$, then $B = C$ " and "The substances are at equal temperature. There is no heat exchange." The explanations of the PSTs regarding the first LoTD are given in Table 4. The second question was: How do you explain the first law of thermodynamics?

Table 4 Explanations of the PSTs about the first LoTD

Answers	Prospective Science Teacher	<i>f</i>
Energy cannot be created or destroyed. Only the transformation takes place.	PST1, 4-5, 9-19, 21, 23-30, 32-33, 35-36, 41, 43, 45, 47, 49-50, 52-58, 60-61, 64-65, 67-69, 71-74	51
It is the conservation of energy.	PST48, 51, 66	3
Heat transfer between materials with different temperatures is heat exchange.	PST46, 62	2
The change in the system's internal energy is the difference between the amount of heat given to that system and the work it applies to its environment.	PST44, 70	2
Express heat movements.	PST20	1
Heat and temperature progress from high to low.	PST22	1
It is about heat and temperature. For example, the ozone layer is perforated.	PST34	1
No sudden change in heat and temperature.	PST8	1
The internal energy of a closed system is constant.	PST39	1
The relationship between heat and work.	PST63	1
Total amount of matter and energy conservation.	PST59	1
No description.	PST2-3, 6, 7, 31, 37, 38, 40, 42	9

In Table 4, the PSTs explained the first LoTD to a large extent ($f = 51$) in such a way "Energy cannot be created or destroyed. Only the transformation takes place". Table 5 shows the explanations of the PSTs about the second LoTD. The third question was: How do you explain the second law of thermodynamics?

1 **Table 5** Explanations of the PSTs about the second LoTD

Answers	Prospective Science Teacher	<i>f</i>
Heat is converted to work, and work is converted to heat.	PST19, 27, 29, 44, 50-52, 54, 56, 59-60, 64, 69, 71	14
Heat transfer is from hot to cold.	PST5, 11, 13, 25-26, 57, 62-63, 70	9
No system efficiency can be greater than 1, and there are losses.	PST4, 41, 43, 45, 49, 53, 66	7
It is about the transformation of energy.	PST35, 68, 72	3
As a result of the heating process, the ambient temperature does not change.	PST14	1
As entropy increases, light slows down and then disappears.	PST39	1
Energy cannot be created or destroyed. Only the transformation takes place.	PST22	1
Everything goes in the direction of increasing entropy.	PST47	1
Heat is converted to light, and light is converted to heat.	PST24	1
It is the acceleration of the object which is released from high downwards.	PST40	1
It relates to inertia and the heat-receiving material expands.	PST33	1
The heat given is equal to the heat taken.	PST20	1
The received temperature is equal to the given temperature.	PST12	1
The relationship between heat balance and conservation.	PST32	1
They are spontaneous reactions with low threshold energy in the universe.	PST65	1
When enthalpy increases, the heat slows down and its shape disappears.	PST42	1
No description.	PST1-3, 6, 7-10, 15-18, 21, 23, 28, 30-31, 34, 36-38, 46, 48, 55, 58, 61, 67, 73-74	29

2

3 The PSTs tried to explain the second LoTD with "Heat is converted to work, and

4 work is converted to heat", "Heat transfer is from hot to cold" and "No system efficiency

5 can be greater than 1, there are losses." The explanations of the PSTs about the third

LoTD are given in Table 6. The fourth question was: How do you explain the third law of thermodynamics?

Table 6 Explanations of the PSTs about the third LoTD

Answers	Prospective Science Teacher	<i>f</i>
When the absolute temperature is reached, the entropy remains constant or approaches the constant and the particles come to a halt.	PST15, 26-27, 29, 41, 43-45, 47-48, 50-52, 54, 56-57, 59, 64, 66, 69-72	21
A substance cannot be cooled to the absolute temperature.	PST4, 24, 39, 42, 49, 53, 55, 61, 63	9
Heat exchange.	PST12, 34	2
Boiling takes place at a certain temperature.	PST14	1
Each substance has internal energy and as temperature increases then motion increases.	PST62	1
Heat transfer is from hot to cold.	PST35	1
It is the expansion of the universe.	PST65	1
No colder environment than absolute temperature.	PST74	1
Temperature is the sum of the heat.	PST22	1
No description.	PST1-3, 5-9, 13, 16-21, 23, 25, 28, 30-33, 36-38, 40, 46, 58, 60, 67-68, 73	32

Finally, the PSTs tried to explain the third LoTD with the words, “When the absolute zero temperature is reached, entropy remains constant or approaches constant and particles come to a halt” and “A substance cannot be cooled to the absolute temperature.”

3.2. The Findings Obtained from the Analyses of the PSTs’ Explanations by Reasoning EPs with LoTD

Table 7 shows the frequency distributions in understanding explanations made to the questions that the PSTs are asked to make reasoning EPs with the LoTD.

Table 7 The frequencies of PSTs’ explanations by associating EPs with LoTD

Questions	SU (<i>f</i>)	LU (<i>f</i>)	PU (<i>f</i>)	MU (<i>f</i>)	NU (<i>f</i>)
Does a car bring an EP while running? Please explain the reasons.	0	4	68	1	1

Is it possible for a gasoline automobile's engine (internal combustion engines) to operate at 100% energy efficiency? Explain the reasons.	1	6	48	13	6
Does double-glazed windows harm the environment? Explain the reasons.	0	4	51	11	8
Does air conditioners harm the environment? Explain the reasons.	0	5	53	8	8
How can you relate the transition from light bulb to LED lighting technology with environmental issues, considering the LoTD? Please explain the reasons.	0	1	17	22	34
How does global warming affect the entropy of our world? Please explain the reasons.	0	8	46	14	6
Does urbanization, which intensifies along the rivers, affect entropy? Please explain the reasons.	2	10	46	9	7
How is the temperature of a lake measured with a mercury thermometer? Does it matter for the measurement if the water in the lake dirty or clean? Please explain the reasons.	0	2	20	28	24
How do you relate the energy conversion in nuclear power plants to the LoTD? How do these transformations affect the environment? Please explain the reasons.	0	4	56	1	13
Would it be effective to open the door of a working refrigerator to cool the kitchen on a hot summer day or open the door of a working oven to heat it on a cold winter day? Please explain the reasons.	0	1	7	58	8
How does the thermometer with the digital display measure the temperature in clean and dirty weather in the city center? Does clean or dirty air affect the measurement? Please explain the reasons.	0	1	37	25	11
f_{total} (%)	3 (0.37 %)	46 (5.65 %)	449 (55.1 6%)	190 (23.3 4%)	126 (15.4 8%)

- 1
- 2 PSTs are expected to relate the situation contained in the first question with the
- 3 first LoTD. Since car engines do not work at 100% efficiency, they provide nature with
- 4 unused energy in the form of heat. It causes the greenhouse effect and exhaust gases. Yet
- 5 these gases cause air pollution and thus water and soil pollution. They also cause sound

1 pollution due to engine and horn sounds. The first question was answered as “Exhaust
2 gas pollutes the environment, i.e. air” by PST1, and his answer was placed under PU
3 category. PST11 said that “Exhaust gases cause air pollution. Besides, this pollution will
4 cause pollution of rainwater and soil,” and her answer was placed in LU category.

5 The second question was answered by PST10 as “It is not possible normally. But
6 it is possible if they can remove the friction force,” and this answer was placed in PU
7 category. PST25 answered the same question as “It cannot work in 100% efficiency. Heat
8 will be released, and entropy will increase. It concerns the second LoTD. Besides, energy
9 cannot be created or destroyed. There is the only conversion of energy,” and his answer
10 was placed in SU category.

11 The situation given in the third question can be associated with the first LoTD by
12 PSTs. It is environmentally friendly because entropy increases less, chemicals used in
13 wooden windows are not used, and have good heat and sound insulation. The third
14 question was answered as “No harm. Because double-glazed windows provide heat and
15 sound insulation and reduce the factors that may cause harm to the environment,” and
16 their answers were placed in LU category. Besides, PST3 and 69 said that “No harm, it
17 provides heat insulation,” and their answers were placed under PU category.

18 Regarding the fourth question, although air conditioners save energy, air
19 conditioners increase the system's entropy as in all heat treatments following the second
20 LoTD. Also, air conditioning gas (freon) causes serious damage to the ozone layer. The
21 fourth question was answered by PST3 as “Yes. The sound coming from the engine
22 pollutes the environment” and PST4 “Yes. Because it has serious damages to the ozone
23 layer.” and these answers were both placed under PU category. PST16 and 32 answered
24 as “Air conditioners work on the principle of energy conversion. According to the second

LoTD, they do not work in 100% efficiency and there is an increase in entropy and harm to the environment.” and their answers were placed in LU category.

PSTs are expected to relate the situation in this question to the second LoTD. According to this law, the entropy of the system increases in all energy-consuming processes in the universe. Considering that LED lighting is more efficient, longer-lasting, and uses less energy than bulbs, it is a more sensitive technology for the environment. The fifth question was answered by PST25 as “There is more energy loss in bulbs than LED lighting technologies. According to the first law of thermodynamics, some of the energy is converted to heat.” in PU category.

According to the entropy law, all beings in the universe are doomed to decay. This is an inevitable transformation. Global warming also shortens this conversion time and contributes to the disorganization of the system. Therefore, the situation in this question is expected to be associated with the second LoTD. The sixth question was answered by PST9 and 11 as “Entropy means disorder or imbalance in the system. Global warming is also triggering this disorder.” Their answers were placed in the LU category. PST21 answered, “It increases the entropy, the irregularity occurs,” and responded in PU category.

PSTs are expected to associate the situation contained in the problem with the second and third LoTD. In this problem, the urbanization concentrated on the edges of the stream increases the entropy of the system. The seventh question was answered by PST1 in such a way that “The balance of water is disturbed by wastes by the communities settling on the rivers, and it causes deterioration and increase of entropy.” and this answer was placed in SU category. For the same question PST2 said that “Urbanization results in irregularity and entropy increases,” and her response was appropriate for LU category.

1 PST8 and 9 stated that in PU category in such a way that “Yes it does because imbalance
2 occurs in some places due to dense settlement, and some places less dense settlement.”

3 For the eighth question, it can be said that the most accurate measurement is taken
4 at the same time, by taking the average of a large number of measurements taken from
5 different points of the lake. The temperature of the dirty lake water will be measured more
6 since it will absorb the light more. Therefore, PSTs are expected to relate to the zeroth
7 LoTD in this question. The eighth question was answered by PST15 in accordance with
8 LU category in such a way that “Water being dirty or clean will affect the temperature
9 because it can hold the sun's rays.” In addition, PST33 is in PU category with the answer
10 “Measurement cannot be made with mercury thermometer, but the more polluted the
11 water, the warmer it is.”

12 It is thought that PSTs may associate the case of the ninth question with all LoTD
13 because there is an irreversible process between heat and energy in this question.
14 However, for this question, PSTs were especially expected to establish a relationship with
15 the second LoTD due to the change of energy. However, this system does not work with
16 100% efficiency, and a large amount of coolant is used in these plants. These fluids also
17 increase the temperature of the rivers and lakes in that region. Therefore, it causes an
18 increase in entropy. The ninth question was answered by PST9 as, “The first and third
19 laws of thermodynamics are concerned. There is energy conversion. It affects positively
20 for being an effective energy source and adversely affects the environment due to
21 radioactive pollution.” in LU category. PST14 said that “Energy cannot be created or
22 destroyed. There is no energy conversion” in MU category.

23 These devices (refrigerator and oven) transfer heat. In other words, it displaces
24 cold air with hot air. While doing this work, the electric motor is used, and this motor will

1 heat the environment while it is running. So both devices act like electric heaters, so both
2 heat the environment. Therefore, PSTs are expected to relate the situation to the second
3 LoTD. The tenth question was responded by PST38 as “The refrigerator will work harder
4 to cool the environment and will emit heat. The opposite goes for the oven. Total
5 temperature does not change,” and this response was placed in LU category.

6 The situation given in this question is expected to relate to the zeroth LoTD by
7 PSTs. Digital display thermometers measure using electronic circuits. The dirty air
8 temperature is measured more than it should, since the dirty substances in the air will
9 absorb the light rays more. The eleventh question was answered by PST4 following the
10 PU category with the words “yes it affects, the temperature is measured more accurately
11 if the air is clean.” PST57 said that “It affects temperature. The polluted air will shed the
12 sunlight.” This answer was placed in the LU category.

13 **4. Discussion**

14 In parallel with the findings section, the discussion section is presented under two
15 headings: (1) Discussion on the knowledge levels of the PSTs about LoTD is presented
16 under the first title. (2) The discussion of the PSTs’ explanations made by reasoning EPs
17 with LoTD is presented under the second heading.

18 **4.1. Discussion on the Knowledge Levels of the PSTs about LoTD**

19 When the explanations of the PSTs regarding the zeroth LoTD are examined, it is
20 seen that most of the PSTs’ explanations are related to thermal equilibrium and heat
21 exchange. Similarly, Başer and Çataloğlu (2005) also found that students had a
22 misconception that “when two liquids are mixed, the temperature of the new mixture is
23 the sum of the temperatures of both liquids.”

When the PSTs' explanations regarding the first LoTD are examined, it is seen that the explanations focus on the "energy cannot be created or cannot be destroyed and it is the transformation of energy." Yeo and Zandik (2001) found that students had difficulty understanding the first LoTD and applying this law in problem-solving. Loverude, Kautz, and Heron (2002) and Meltzer (2007) have reported that university students emerge with significant learning difficulties related to fundamental concepts in thermodynamics, such as heat, work, cyclic processes, and the first LoTD. In contrast, Klimenko (2012) found that students understand the first LoTD but cannot comprehend entropy and the second LoTD and third LoTD. In this study, when the explanations of the PSTs regarding the second LoTD are examined, the explanations of the PSTs are generally grouped under three statements: Heat and work transformation, heat transfer and efficiency. Loverude, Kautz, and Heron (2002), and Christensen, Meltzer, and Ogilvie (2009) stated that students do not understand the second LoTD and entropy. In this study, when the explanations of the PSTs regarding the third LoTD are examined, the statements of the PSTs are usually related to absolute temperature. A significant part of the absolute temperature explanation is that when the absolute temperature is reached, the entropy will remain constant and the particles will come to a halt. Sözbilir (2002) and Haglund, Andersson, and Elmgren (2016) revealed that students could not understand the concept of entropy, the central concept of thermodynamics. In Sreenivasulu and Subramaniam's (2013) study, it was determined that students have alternative concepts related to enthalpy, entropy concepts, and energy transfer, and third LoTD issues.

It was determined that a significant part of the PSTs could not explain the zeroth LoTD, second LoTD and third LoTD. To overcome these shortcomings in the literature, learning environments using different teaching approaches and methods have been

developed and the effectiveness of these environments has been tested. They found that context-based learning and problem-based learning (Baran & Sözbilir, 2018) were useful in teaching thermodynamics subjects and concepts. Tanel (2006) designed a cooperative learning environment to complement these students' deficiencies and revealed that this learning environment increased academic achievement. However, Kulkarni and Tambade (2013) found that computer-assisted instruction effectively determines students' understanding of LoTD.

4.2. Discussion of the PSTs' Explanations by Reasoning EPs with LoTD

When the explanations made by the PSTs concerning EPs with LoTD are examined, it is seen that the PSTs' answers were concentrated in PU category (Table 7). In the explanations regarding the EPs in the first, second, fourth and eleventh questions, it is seen that some of the PSTs reasoned the situations related to the given EPs with entropy and some of them are related with air pollution. For example, when the opinions of the PSTs about air conditioners were taken in the fourth question, it was determined that many the PSTs stated that air conditioners were harmful to ozone layer, but a small number of these PSTs were able to reason with the second LoTD considering the working principle of air conditioners and indicated an increase in entropy. However, it was seen that the PSTs could have reasoned air pollution with LoTD; Kırtak (2010) revealed that the prospective teachers stated that air pollution cannot be explained by LoTD in her study. In the second, third, fifth and tenth questions, the EPs' explanations were focused on the concept of entropy and reasoned with the change of entropy. In the case of the third question, it was seen that most of the PSTs said that double-glazed windows were beneficial to the environment because they prevent heat transfer and provide heat insulation. The answers to this question were also associated with recycling. However, it

1 is noteworthy that the PSTs could not relate the first LoTD to this situation even though
2 they referred to heat transfer for the situation in this question. The situation related to the
3 ninth question's energy transformations was explained mostly by the answers at the level
4 of "partially correct" comprehension and some of the PSTs could have been reasoned
5 with the first LoTD and third LoTD. It has been revealed in the literature that energy
6 transformations cannot be understood by the participants at different levels (Pidgeon &
7 Demski, 2012).

8 In this study, for the eighth question which was asked if a lake's temperature was
9 measured by thermometer, it was determined that the PSTs explained the case by thermal
10 equilibrium or heat exchange. Similarly, Kirtak (2010) found that prospective teachers
11 explained the situation related to the zeroth LoTD by thermal equilibrium. In the tenth
12 question, almost all of the PSTs' answers about the condition of using the refrigerator to
13 cool the environment or to heat the environment with the oven were in the
14 misunderstanding category. Since the environment in which the refrigerator/oven is not
15 isolated, these devices should be operated up to the equilibrium temperature in open
16 systems, which is indicated by the experts involved in this study, which means that too
17 much energy usage and entropy increase. In the study of Cochran, and Heron (2006), it
18 was stated that university students could not apply the second LoTD to systems such as
19 heat machines and refrigerators, and often explained the first LoTD instead of the second
20 LoTD. The EPs in the seventh and eighth questions can be related to water pollution. In
21 the seventh question, the effect of urbanization on the riverside entropy is observed that
22 the PSTs stated that with the increase of urbanization, water balance will be
23 disrupted/water will be polluted and entropy will increase. The PSTs' knowledge of water
24 pollution may not be sufficient to interpret the EP by reasoning it with the LoTD. Covitt,

Gunckel, and Anderson (2009) stated that environmental literacy related to water is related to water and the human-environment's natural structure. For this purpose, students must know the nature of water and its ability to be found in nature in different forms. In this study, it is seen that water pollution is partly related to LoTD.

Contrary to this situation, Kırtak (2010) found that prospective teachers cannot explain water pollution by LoTD. In the sixth question, it was seen that the PSTs' answers were placed in the category of partial understanding about the situation of the global warming affecting the entropy of the world and they stated that global warming would disrupt the balance and increase the entropy. Kırtak (2010) found similar expressions in the study and it was determined that the prospective teachers explained global warming by using the second LoTD.

These findings show that the PSTs could not have established a relationship between LoTD and EPs in terms of energy pollution (Kırtak-Ad & Demirci, 2012). However, a small number of PSTs stated that some EPs could have been explained with the help of LoTD in this study. It has been determined in different studies in the literature that prospective teachers have difficulties in explaining the LoTD to the events in daily life and explaining these events with related LoTD (Kırtak, 2010; Öztaş, 2005; Tokuya, Yamamoto & Takashi, 2004). In contrast, Smith (2001) stated that the cause of many EPs can be explained with the help of LoTD. Besides, it was stated by the experts who participated in this study that many of the EPs caused by entropy changes in the environment. An essential part of the PSTs who participated in this study could not make reasoning EPs with entropy and entropy change. This suggests that PSTs do not understand the concept of entropy as mentioned in the literature (Haglund, Andersson & Elmgren, 2016; Sözbilir & Bennett, 2007; Sreenivasulu & Subramaniam, 2013;

Christensen, Meltzer & Ogilvie, 2009). It has also been found that entropy is mixed with energy (Battino, 2007; Kulkarni & Tambade, 2013; Sozbilir, 2002; Sözbilir & Bennett, 2007; Yeo & Zandik, 2001).

In summary, the ninth question's situation is a situation where it can be explained by using all the LoTD and the situations in the second and fifth questions together with the second and third LoTD. The situations in the eighth and eleventh questions are determined by the zeroth LoTD; situations in the first and third questions can be explained by the first LoTD; situations in the fourth, sixth and tenth questions can be explained by the second LoTD, and the situation in the seventh question can be explained by the third LoTD. While answering questions about EPs in this study, PSTs made explanations using concepts such as entropy and energy instead of making explanations using LoTD. This situation is considered as another finding that supports that PSTs do not have sufficient knowledge about LoTD. Similarly, Bain, Moon, Mack and Tows (2014) stated that in different studies conducted in the literature, students have alternative concepts related to thermodynamic issues and have difficulty understanding this subject for various reasons.

5. Conclusion

When the information about the LoTD of the PSTs were examined as a whole, it was found that the PSTs did not have sufficient knowledge about LoTD. This can be explained by the fact that the PSTs have not been able to adopt LoTD during their education or be explained by prejudice against the issues related to LoTD. The PSTs' lack of knowledge about the LoTD is thought to be the main reason underlying their inability to make reasoning LoTD with EPs. Because the PSTs stated that some EPs can be explained with the help of LoTD, but they are not being able to make these explanations

at the expected level can be interpreted as another indication that the PSTs do not have enough knowledge about LoTD.

Although it was observed that the PSTs had received LoTD and environmental issues during their undergraduate education, they were found to have difficulty applying any LoTD to a daily event or EPs. At this point, the quality of teaching as a source of information deficiencies should be questioned. While eliminating the deficiencies identified, it is recommended that teaching should be supported with cases and events from daily life, especially EPs. It is believed that preparing and presenting an enriched learning environment during this teaching will strengthen the students' knowledge structures. However, the entropy concept should be well understood, and the relationship between this concept and environmental issues and LoTD should be emphasized.

EPs should be emphasized in 'Environmental Science' courses and should be discussed in connection with ecology issues. At this point, teachers who are far from EPs, lack ecological knowledge and culture, do not have deep knowledge and knowledge, are not equipped with vast experience and skills, and cannot be exemplary to children with their behaviors will be challenging to achieve the targeted success in environmental education.

References

- Abraham, M. R., Williamson, V. M., & Westbrook, S. L. (1994). A cross-age study of the understanding of five chemistry concepts. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 31(2), 147-165. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.3660310206>
- Bain, K., Moon, A., Mack, M. R., & Towns, M. H. (2014). A review of research on the teaching and learning of thermodynamics at the university level. *Chemistry*

Education Research and Practice, 15(3), 320-335.
<https://doi.org/10.1039/C4RP00011K>

Baran, M., & Sözbilir, M. (2018). An application of context-and problem-based learning (C-PBL) into teaching thermodynamics. *Research in Science Education*, 48(4), 663-689. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9583-1>

Başer, M., & Çataloğlu, E. (2005). Effect of conceptual change oriented instruction on remediation of students' misconceptions related to heat and temperature concepts. *H.U. Journal of Education*, 29, 43-52. Retrieved from http://www.efdergi.hacettepe.edu.tr/shw_artcl-763.html

Battino, R. (2007). "Mysteries" of the first and second laws of thermodynamics. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 84(5), 753-755. <https://doi.org/10.1021/ed084p753>

Çalık, M., & Cobern, W. W. (2017). A cross-cultural study of CKCM efficacy in an undergraduate chemistry classroom. *Chemistry Education Research and Practice*, 18, 691-730. <https://doi.org/10.1039/C7RP00016B>

Christensen, W. M., Meltzer, D. E., & Ogilvie, C. A. (2009). Student ideas regarding entropy and the second law of thermodynamics in an introductory physics course. *American Journal of Physics*, 77(10), 907-917. <https://doi.org/10.1119/1.3167357>

Cochran, M. J., & Heron, P. R. (2006). Development and assessment of research-based tutorials on heat engines and the second law of thermodynamics. *American Journal of Physics*, 74(8), 734-741. <https://doi.org/10.1119/1.2198889>

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th edition). New York: Routledge.

- Coştu, B., Ünal, S., & Ayas, A. (2007). The use of daily-life events in science teaching. *Ahi Evran University Kırşehir Journal of Education Faculty*, 8(1), 197-207. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/1495944>
- Cotignola, M. I., Bordogna, C., Punte, G., & Cappannini, O. M. (2002). Difficulties in learning thermodynamic concepts: Are they linked to the historical development of this field? *Science & Education*, 11, 279-291. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015205123254>
- Covitt, A. B., Gunckel, L. K., & Anderson, W. C. (2009). Students' developing understanding of water in environmental systems. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, 40(3), 37-51. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JOEE.40.3.37-51>
- Haglund, J., Andersson, S., & Elmgren, M. (2016). Language aspects of engineering students' view of entropy. *Chemistry Education Research and Practice*, 17(3), 489-508. <https://doi.org/10.1039/C5RP00227C>
- Harrison, A. G., Grayson, D. J., & Treagust, D. F. (1999). Investigating a grade 11 student's evolving conceptions of heat and temperature. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 36(1), 55-78. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1098-2736\(199901\)36:1<55::AID-TEA5>3.0.CO;2-P](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-2736(199901)36:1<55::AID-TEA5>3.0.CO;2-P)
- Kahyaoğlu, M. (2009). Perspectives, readiness and self-efficacy of pre-service teachers related to teaching environmental problems in the context of science and technology education. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Journal of Education Faculty*, 9(17), 28- 40.
- Kırtak-Ad, V. N., & Demirci, N. (2012). Prospective teachers' levels of associating environmental problems with science fields and thermodynamics laws. *Ahi Evran*

1 *University Kırşehir Journal of Education Faculty*, 13(3), 19-46. Retrieved from
2 <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/1491685>

3 Kirtak, V. N. (2010). *Prospective physics, chemistry and biology teachers' levels of*
4 *associating thermodynamics laws with daily life and environmental problems*
5 (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Balıkesir University, Turkey (in Turkish).

6 Klimenko, A. Y. (2012). Teaching the third law of thermodynamics. *The Open*
7 *Thermodynamics Journal*, 6, 1-14. DOI: 10.2174/1874396X01206010001

8 Kulkarni, V. D., & Tambade, P. S. (2013). Assessing the conceptual understanding about
9 heat and thermodynamics at undergraduate level. *European Journal of Physics*
10 *Education*, 4(2), 9-16. Retrieved from [http://www.eu-](http://www.eu-journal.org/index.php/EJPE/article/view/85)
11 [journal.org/index.php/EJPE/article/view/85](http://www.eu-journal.org/index.php/EJPE/article/view/85)

12 Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for
13 categorical data. *Biometrics*, 33(1), 159-174. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2529310>

14 Loverude, M. E., Kautz, C. H., & Heron, P. R. L. (2002). Student understanding of the
15 first law of thermodynamics: Relating work to the adiabatic compression of an
16 ideal gas. *American Journal of Physics*, 70(2), 137-148.
17 <https://doi.org/10.1119/1.1417532>

18 Mansson, B. A., & McGlade, J. M. (1993). Ecology, thermodynamics and H.T. Odum's
19 conjectures. *Oecologia*, 93, 582-596. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00328969>

20 Meltzer, D. E. (2007, January). *Investigation of student learning in thermodynamics and*
21 *implications for instruction in chemistry and engineering*. In AIP Conference
22 Proceedings (Vol. 883, No. 1, pp. 38-41). American Institute of Physics.
23 <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.2508686>

- 1 Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd edition).
2 California: Sage Publications.
- 3 Öztaş, F. (2005). A research towards establishing 9th grade secondary school students'
4 opinions on material cycle and energy flow. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 13(2),
5 381-390.
- 6 Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd edition).
7 Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- 8 Pidgeon, N., & Demski, C. C. (2012). From nuclear to renewable: Energy system
9 transformation and public attitudes. *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, 68(4), 41-
10 51. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0096340212451592>
- 11 Ribeiro, G. T. C. (1992). Entropy and the second principle of thermodynamics—Fourth
12 year undergraduates' ideas. *Research in Assessment*, 9, 23-36.
- 13 Smith, C. (2001). *Environmental physics* (2nd edition). New York: Routledge.
- 14 Sozbilir, M. (2002). Turkish chemistry undergraduate students' misunderstandings of
15 Gibbs free energy. *University Chemistry Education*, 6(2), 73-83.
- 16 Sözbilir, M. (2004). What makes physical chemistry difficult?: Perceptions of Turkish
17 chemistry undergraduates and lecturers. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 81(4),
18 573–578. <https://doi.org/10.1021/ed081p573>
- 19 Sözbilir, M., & Bennett, M. J. (2007). A study of Turkish chemistry undergraduates'
20 understandings of entropy. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 84(7), 1204-1208.
21 <https://doi.org/10.1021/ed084p1204>
- 22 Sreenivasulu, B., & Subramaniam, R. (2013). University students' understanding of
23 chemical thermodynamics. *International Journal of Science Education*, 35(4),
24 601-635. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2012.683460>

- 1 Tanel, R. (2006). Investigation of the effects of the cooperative learning method on
2 understanding the second law of thermodynamics and entropy (Unpublished
3 doctoral dissertation). Dokuz Eylul University, Turkey (in Turkish).
- 4 Tatar, E., & Oktay, M. (2011). The effectiveness of problem-based learning on teaching
5 the first law of thermodynamics. *Research in Science & Technological Education*,
6 29(3), 315-332. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02635143.2011.599318>
- 7 Thomas P. L., & Schwenz R. W. (1998). College physical chemistry students'
8 conceptions of equilibrium and fundamental thermodynamics. *Journal of*
9 *Research in Science Teaching*, 35(10), 1151–1160.
10 [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1098-2736\(199812\)35:10<1151::AID-](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-2736(199812)35:10<1151::AID-TEA6>3.0.CO;2-K)
11 [TEA6>3.0.CO;2-K](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-2736(199812)35:10<1151::AID-TEA6>3.0.CO;2-K)
- 12 Tokuya, I., Yamamoto, G., & Takashi, S. (2004). How do students understand and
13 environmental issues in relation to physics. In Y. Park (Ed.), *Teaching and*
14 *Learning of Physics in Cultural Contexts* (pp. 165-180). Cheongwon, South
15 Korea: World Scientific Publication.
16 https://doi.org/10.1142/9789812702890_0017
- 17 Uzun, N., & Sağlam, N. (2006). Development and validation of an environmental
18 attitudes scale for high school students. *H.U. Journal of Education*, 30, 240-250.
19 Retrieved from http://www.efdergi.hacettepe.edu.tr/shw_artcl-745.html
- 20 Yaman, F., Ayas, A., & Çalık, M. (2019). Facilitating grade 11 students' conceptual
21 understanding of fundamental acid-base models. *Turkish Journal of Education*,
22 8(1), 16-32. <https://doi.org/10.19128/turje.449100>

- 1 Yeo, S., & Zandik, M. (2001). Introductory thermal concept evaluation: Assessing
2 students' understanding. *The Physics Teacher*, 39, 496-504.
3 <https://doi.org/10.1119/1.1424603>
- 4 Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2011). *Qualitative research methods in social sciences* (8th
5 edition). Ankara: Seckin Publishing.
- 6 Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (3rd
7 edition). Thousand Oaks: Sage publications.
- 8 Yücel, S. A., & Morgil, İ. (1998). Investigation of environmental phenomena in
9 undergraduate education. *H.U. Journal of Education*, 14, 84-91. Retrieved from
10 http://www.efdergi.hacettepe.edu.tr/shw_artcl-1183.html