

## EFFECTIVENESS OF FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE IN TEACHING AND LEARNING PROCESS OF ELEMENTARY STATISTICS

1. A.G.Senthil Raja, M.Phil scholar,  
Mathematics Department,

Bharath Institute Of Higher Education and Research, Chennai, India.

2. Dr. K.Ramalakshmi, Assistant Professor,  
Mathematics Department,

Bharath Institute of Higher Education and Research, Chennai, India.

<sup>1</sup> [senthilrajasankari0@gmail.com](mailto:senthilrajasankari0@gmail.com) , <sup>2</sup> [ramalakshmi.maths@bharathuniv.ac.in](mailto:ramalakshmi.maths@bharathuniv.ac.in)

### Address for Correspondence

1. A.G.Senthil Raja, M.Phil scholar,  
Mathematics Department,

Bharath Institute Of Higher Education and Research, Chennai, India.

2. Dr. K.Ramalakshmi, Assistant Professor,  
Mathematics Department,

Bharath Institute of Higher Education and Research, Chennai, India.

<sup>1</sup> [senthilrajasankari0@gmail.com](mailto:senthilrajasankari0@gmail.com) , <sup>2</sup> [ramalakshmi.maths@bharathuniv.ac.in](mailto:ramalakshmi.maths@bharathuniv.ac.in)

### Abstract

The usefulness regarding diverse educational pathways often becomes empirical, and it always varies depending upon spontaneous opinions among participants [1,2]. Despite its simplicity, educators striving toward innovative and cost - effective strategies to conduct computational concepts keep attempting to engage through integrated teaching methods. As a consequence, further independent inquiry into that same efficiency of integrated recruitment channels with participants' quantitative understanding also seemed to be expected. This analysis evaluated the association regarding educational outcomes towards diverse educational formative assessments including overall statistics standardized tests. Relevant factors being established with potential explanations trying to resolve response rates, as well as nonparametric and analysis of covariance measures have been investigated the treatment, ecosystem, instructional consequences, as well as educational outcomes rate as people of diverse backgrounds to any of these two objectives.

**Keywords:** Statistical Decision Making, Content Acquaintance, Self-Efficacy, Perceived Efficacy, Control Group.

**Mathematics Subject Classification:** 97K<sub>40</sub>

## **1. Introduction**

Dependent parameters becoming recognised through alternative hypotheses attempting to address behavioural responses, and even some frequency domain including interpretation with correlation coefficients factors have indeed been analysed that diagnosis, environment, educational implications, and academic performance frequency among participants across disparate backgrounds to those other different goals [5,6,7]. Different approaches through learning processes have indeed been mentioned throughout high school statistics classes. Educators who use such approaches showed higher academic performance with either the educational environment, social competence, as well as the impression that academic achievement was stronger than learners should just have accomplished performing on its own. Although highest quality learning styles were incorporated throughout tool for evaluating, the findings towards better attitudes away from traditional facts and figures were good. Students' participation across most dimensions including regression techniques – finding information, undertaking assessments, including interpreting findings – qualitative researchers throughout academic achievement as well as program outcomes [9,10].

## **2. MOTIVATION OF THE INVESTIGATION**

One of the incitements behind developing the above framework became anything like a deterministic universe wherein participants might acquire data to address the research infectious disease queries. Even though it is easy to manufacture measured data for something like a systematic review, we acknowledge that reasoning through concerns throughout genomics necessarily implies accessibility to something like a demographic which can only be investigated extremely systematically [12]. The current study sought to investigate the effect of credible ventures towards academic achievement throughout pedagogical skills. Student-defined as well as truthful assignments are included, in which participants also have their own parameters, formulated about their same questions of the study, however compiled and interpreted with their original sets of data [14,15]. These ventures were generally delivered by educators comprising two or three. Content awareness, perceived utility of statistics, but instead self-efficacy towards data stored in an array have been the student outcomes of interest. Besides which, although the sampling frame comprised numerous educators and perhaps a wider variety of participants, these same investigators sought to investigate potential differences in some of these consequences caused by various educators' performance including its instructional cumulative insightful information [19].

### **3. DATA COLLECTION, VARIABLES AND INSTRUMENTS**

A quasi-experimental configuration has also been used to control for the unavoidable factual inaccuracies incorporated through discrepancies in educators. Every other contributing instructor began through demonstrating some and sometimes more components of everyone's achievement test with implementing assignments into another learning journey. Those other portions identified as that of the study's influence categories. The only first stage including its analysis often referred known as the great control phase, even though it is throughout that stage of development that every other instructor taught himself and control component. This same control process concerned 82 of the 112 students who were enrolled throughout the analysis. The leftover 30 students remained awaiting evaluation. Eventually, satisfaction rating applies to something like the student's overall performance course ranking. A, B, C, D, and F have all been significant advancements. It should have been acknowledged that perhaps the student's success upon this instructional experiment seems to have no significance upon student's achievement scores; summative assessment grades being determined regardless of their performance mostly on teacher competence assessment used during the experiment.

### **4. DATA INVESTIGATION AND INTERPRETATIONS**

SAS had been used for data analysis. A three-factor quadratic configuration including period, trainer, as well as level of achievement even though parameters was being used to design its triple dependent variable employing multinomial logistic regression. Especially during the peak three-way connection mostly in multivariate model, the probability distributions were set up and modelled leveraging three-factor polynomial models. Almost every main objective of this investigation through considerations including certain stage, framework, as well as academic performance. Diagnostic checks being carried out to evaluate particular instructional consequences, including phase, trainer, and academic performance as parameters. For the both hypotheses studies, the threshold statistical importance had been established around 0.01. In the follow-up observations, Fisher's secured minimum substantial change was being used to implement complex measurements. Table 1 summarizes explanatory details for the 112 respondents again for three academic performance. Experimental group contributors who did not attend that actualization measure aren't included in evaluation. Furthermore, one participant throughout the treatment group didn't even finish their anticipated usefulness experiment and was instead exempted from either the corresponding assessment.

*Research Paper*

Table 1: Three pupil direct consequence indicators include descriptive and inferential statistics

| Outcome              | Stage     | n   | Mean  | Standard Deviation |
|----------------------|-----------|-----|-------|--------------------|
| Content Acquaintance | Control   | 101 | 4.12  | 2.12               |
|                      | Treatment | 19  | 7.89  | 3.12               |
| Self-Efficacy        | Control   | 98  | 11.29 | 4.49               |
|                      | Treatment | 22  | 14.42 | 5.12               |
| Perceived Efficacy   | Control   | 88  | 19.32 | 5.89               |
|                      | Treatment | 32  | 24.65 | 6.74               |

Table 2: Holding descriptive and inferential statistics for result variables

| Outcome       | Stage     | Middle School |       |                    | High School |       |                    |
|---------------|-----------|---------------|-------|--------------------|-------------|-------|--------------------|
|               |           | n             | Mean  | Standard Deviation | N           | Mean  | Standard Deviation |
| Content       | Control   | 98            | 3.12  | 1.11               | 101         | 4.12  | 2.12               |
| Acquaintance  | Treatment | 22            | 5.27  | 2.33               | 19          | 7.89  | 3.12               |
| Self-Efficacy | Control   | 78            | 6.11  | 2.97               | 98          | 11.29 | 4.49               |
|               | Treatment | 42            | 8.72  | 3.82               | 22          | 14.42 | 5.12               |
| Perceived     | Control   | 82            | 9.11  | 3.97               | 88          | 19.32 | 5.89               |
| Efficacy      | Treatment | 38            | 13.12 | 4.12               | 32          | 24.65 | 6.74               |

Table 2 provides detailed figures for both the three results. Whereas the treatment group outstripped their control group on any and all three outcomes in each of these environments, test of significance showed that these kinds of disparities remained scientifically valid.

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS

Especially considering the number of observations about anything other than the significance with educational outcomes standard, variables intrinsic across both the middle school and high school settings allowed approaching the significance between participants' varying educational attainment problematic. In either setting, few such children took the grades D or F in the assignment. Since the high school environment had been an advanced placement group, the respondents were really a pre-selected group of teenagers who've been

*Research Paper*

traditionally regarded and considered as better performing individuals; thus, levels of D as well as F were also not systematically distributed. As either a consequence, participants occasionally skipped the school if they assumed certain distinctions were already out of common competence. As a result, ratings like D or F became unlikely in each of these conditions, including in the survey yielded a preliminary representation of the relationship amongst low academic achievement as well as the incorporation with credible proposals. Eventually, several encounters and uncertainties witnessed throughout this analysis reinforce the idea that participants' perception as well as expectations remain shaped by a multitude of considerations, including that of the individual person, contextual environment, and also the participants' individual formative assessment.

**5. REFERENCES**

- [1] Pajares, F., & Schunk, D. (2002). Self and self-belief in psychology and education: A historical perspective. In J. Aronson (Ed.), *Improving academic achievement: Impact of psychological factors on education* (pp. 3–21). New York: Academic Press.
- [2] Roseth, C. J., Garfield, J. B., & Ben-Zvi, D. (2008). Collaboration in learning and teaching statistics. *Journal of Statistics Education*, 16(1). Retrieved from <http://www.amstat.org/publications/jse/v16n1/roseth.html>.
- [3] Schau, C. (2000). Survey of attitudes toward statistics. In J. Maltby, C. A. Lewis, & A. Hill (Eds.), *Commissioned reviews on 250 psychological tests* (pp. 898–901). Lampeter, Wales: Edwin Mellen Press.
- [4] Smith, G. (1998). Learning statistics by doing statistics. *Journal of Statistics Education*, 6(3). Retrieved from <http://www.amstat.org/publications/jse/v6n3/smith.html>
- [5] Spence, D. J., & Sinn, R. (2009). Authentic discovery projects in statistics. In M. Garner (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 3rd annual meeting of the Georgia association of mathematics teacher educators GAMTE*, (pp. 24–34).

*Research Paper*

[6] Spence, D. J., Sinn, R., & Briggs, K. (2009). Authentic discovery projects in elementary statistics. In J. Horn (Ed.), *Engaging approaches: Proceedings of the 7<sup>th</sup> annual teaching matters conference* (pp. 107–115). Barnesville, GA: Gordon Publications.

[7] Yesilcay, Y. (2000). Research project in statistics: Implications of a case study for the undergraduate statistics curriculum. *Journal of Statistics Education*, 8(2). Retrieved from. <http://www.amstat.org/publications/jse/secure/v8n2/yesilcay.cfm>

[8] Zieffler, A., Garfield, J., Alt, S., Dupuis, D., Holleque, K., & Chang, B. (2008). Research project in statistics: Implications of a case study for the undergraduate statistics curriculum. *Journal of Statistics Education*, 16(2). Retrieved from. <http://www.amstat.org/publications/jse/v16n2/zieffler.html>

[9] Zeldin, A. L., & Pajares, F. (2000). Against the odds: Self-efficacy beliefs of women in mathematical, scientific, and technological careers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37, 215–246.

[10] Franklin, C., & Garfield, J. B. (2006). The GAISE Project: Developing statistics education guidelines for pre-K-12 and college courses. In G. Burrill (Ed.), *Thinking and reasoning with data and chance: 68th NCTM yearbook* (pp. 345–375). Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.

[11] Gal, I., & Ginsburg, L. (1994). The role of beliefs and attitudes in learning statistics: Towards an assessment framework. *Journal of Statistics Education*, 2(2). Retrieved from. <http://www.amstat.org/publications/jse/v2n2/gal.html>.

[12] Hackett, G. (1995). Self-efficacy in career choice and development. In A. Bandura (Ed.), *Self-efficacy in changing societies* (pp. 231–258). New York: Cambridge University Press.

[13] Adam Klivans and Raghu Meka, learning graphical models using multiplicative weights, *Proceedings of the Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, 343{354, 2017.

*Research Paper*

[14] David A. Levin, Malwina J. Luczak and Yuval Peres, Glauber dynamics for the Mean-Field Ising Model: cut-off, critical power law, and metastability, *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, Vol. 146 (1-2), 223{265, 2010.

[15] Kirk, R. E. (2007). Changing topics and trends in introductory statistics. In D. S. Dunn, R. A. Smith, & B. C. Beins (Eds.), *Best practices for teaching statistics and research methods in the behavioural sciences* (pp. 25–44). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

[16] Andrea Montanari and Amin Saberi, The spread of innovations in social networks, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, Vol. 107 (47), 20196{20201, 2010.

[17] Pradeep Ravikumar, Martin J. Wainwright and John D. Laerty, High-dimensional Ising model selection using  $\ell_1$ -regularized logistic regression, *The Annals of Statistics*, Vol. 38 (3), 1287{1319, 2010.

[18] Landrum, R. E., & Smith, R. A. (2007). Creating syllabi for statistics and research methods courses. In D. S. Dunn, R. A. Smith, & B. C. Beins (Eds.), *Best practices for teaching statistics and research methods in the behavioural sciences* (pp. 45–57). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

[19] Masuo Suzuki, Solution and critical behaviour of some "Three-Dimensional" Ising Models with a four-spin interaction, *Physical Review Letters*, Vol. 28, 507{510, 1972.

[20] Pajares, F., & Kranzler, J. (1995). Self-efficacy beliefs and general mental ability in mathematical problem-solving. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 20, 426–443.