# Introduction

## Rationale

Technological advancement has led to the emergence of big data (Gould & Çetinkaya-Rundel, 2014) making data inevitable in our daily life. In addition, powerful computers are now easily available . These developments gave way to the emergence of data science as a field. As a result, the practice of statistics has dramatically changed and has distanced away from statistics education (Finzer, 2013; Wood, Mocko, Everson, Horton, & Velleman, 2018; Zeiffler, Garfield, & Fry, 2018). In this regard, Gould (2010), Horton et al. (2015), Horton (2015) and Hardin et al. (2015) pointed out the importance of data management skills and its integration in introductory and second courses in statistics. Nonetheless, some measures are already in place to lessen the gap between statistical practice and statistics education. In 2005, Franklin et al. (2007) put forth the Guidelines for Assessment and Instruction in Statistics Education (GAISE) Report recommending a framework for statistics education both in the k to 12 and college level. In 2016, the GAISE College Report ASA Revision Committee (2016) revisited the effectiveness of the framework and still found it effective. The framework is now the standard in statistics education in the United States and in many countries that adopted it (Zeiffler et al., 2018).

In the GAISE report, one noteworthy recommendation is the “use of technology to explore concepts and analyze data.” Studies have shown that the use of technology can really improve statistics education; equipping learners with relevant data skills and effective powerful tools in this era where data is very much abundant (Chance, Ben-Zvi, Garfield, & Medina, 2007; Chance & Rossman, 2006; Çetinkaya-Rundel & Rundel, 2017; Doi, Potter, Wong, Alcaraz, & Chi, 2016; Harraway, 2012; Stander & Dalla Valle, 2017). Nonetheless, there is no single statistical computing tool that fits all statistical tasks (McNamara, 2018). However, introductory statistics students should be taught a common statistical package such as SAS, SPSS, or R (R Core Team, 2018), enthusing them to continuously learn statistics technology since statistical tools are diverse and eventually evolve through time (Gould et al., 2018).

In our country, leading universities are aware of this issue and have already integrated the use of technology in their curriculum for statistics education. The University of the Philippines for example uses a number of software in its introductory statistics courses and statistics courses (eg. R with RStudio, Python, SAS, SPSS, Stata, MS Excel, QGIS, ArcGIS, Gephi, yEd Graph Editor, and more). Most of the software used are opensource.

In the province, some universities have acquired SPSS to teach statistics courses. On the other hand, some still uses calculators to do and teach statistical computing. Unfortunately, both setup do not lessen the gap between statistics education and statistical practice. In reality, most institutions to which graduates from these universities get employed cannot afford SPSS. One can choose MS Excel as an alternative, however its functions are limited (Biehler, Ben-Zvi, Bakker, & Makar, 2013).
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## Statement of the Problem

1. What are the profile variables of the respondents?
2. What are the technology readiness index scores, calculator test scores, and the RStudio test scores of the respondents?
3. What are the technology readiness index scores, the calculator test scores, and the RStudio test scores of the respondents when grouped according to the profile variables?
4. Is there significant difference in the technology readiness index scores, the calculator test scores, and the RStudio test scores of the respondents when grouped according to the profile variables?
5. Is there a significant relationship between age and the technology readiness index scores, the calculator test scores, and the RStudio test scores of the respondents?
6. Is there a significant relationship between the technology readiness index scores and the RStudio test scores of the respondents?
7. Is there significant difference between the calculator test scores and RStudio test scores of the respondents?

## Statement of the Hypothesis

1. Is there significant difference between the calculator test scores and RStudio test scores of the respondents?
2. the

## Significance of the Study
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## Definition of Terms

# Review of Related Literature and Studies

The choice of which software to use in teaching statistics can be quite a challenge given a lot of things to consider. It can be a problem similar to bridging the gap between the practice of statistics and statistics education. Tools for learning statistics can be used easily by starters opposite to when using tools for doing statistics (Gould et al., 2018). However,

# Methodology

## Research Design

## Research Environment
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## Data Analysis

# Results and Discussion

## Profile Variables of the Respondents

### Gender

**Table 1:** Frequency Distribution Gender

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Gender | Freq | Percentage |
| Female | 5 | 62.5 |
| Male | 3 | 37.5 |
| **Total** | 8 | 100 |

### Have Previous Programming Experience

**Table 2:** Frequency Distribution of Have Previous Programming Experience

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Experienced | Freq | Percentage |
| No | 4 | 50 |
| Yes | 4 | 50 |
| **Total** | 8 | 100 |

### Statistical Computing Tool Preference: Calculator or RStudio

**Table 3:** Frequency Distribution of Statistical Computing Tool Preference

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Preference | Freq | Percentage |
| Calculator | 4 | 50 |
| RStudio | 4 | 50 |
| **Total** | 8 | 100 |

### Age

**Table 4:** Frequency Distribution and Summary of Age

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Age | Freq | Percentage |
| 21 | 4 | 50 |
| 22 | 2 | 25 |
| 24 | 1 | 12.5 |
| 39 | 1 | 12.5 |
| **Total** | 8 | 100 |
| Mean | Median | SD |
| 23.88 | 21.5 | 6.2 |

## Technology Readiness Index Scores, Calculator Test Scores and RStudio Test Scores of the Respondents

### Technology Readiness Index Scores

**Table 5:** Summary of Technology Readiness Index Scores

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Min | Mean | Max | SD |
| 2.7 | 2.962 | 3.4 | 0.2387 |

### Calculator Test Scores

**Table 6:** Frequency Distribution and Summary of Calculator Test Scores

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scores | Freq | | Percentage |
| Failed | 5 | | 62.5 |
| Passed | 3 | | 37.5 |
| **Total** | 8 | | 100 |
| Min | Mean | Max | SD |
| 25 | 46.25 | 100 | 25.06 |

### RStudio Test Scores

**Table 7:** Frequency Distribution and Summary of RStudio Test Scores

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scores | | Freq | | Percentage |
| Failed | | 3 | | 37.5 |
| Passed | | 5 | | 62.5 |
| **Total** | | 8 | | 100 |
| Min | Mean | | Max | SD |
| 24 | 54.5 | | 86 | 21.23 |

## The Technology Readiness Index Scores, Calculator Test Scores, and RStudio Test Scores of the Respondents When Grouped According to the Profile Variables

### Gender

#### Technology Readiness Scores

**Table 8:** Summary of Technology Readiness Index Scores for Gender

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Gender | Min | Mean | Max | SD |
| Female | 2.7 | 2.96 | 3.1 | 0.17 |
| Male | 2.7 | 2.97 | 3.4 | 0.38 |

#### Calculator Test Scores

**Table 9:** Frequency Distribution and Summary of Calculator Test Scores for Gender

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Gender | Failed | Passed | Min | Mean | Max | SD |
| Female | 4 | 1 | 25 | 37 | 54 | 11.94 |
| Male | 1 | 2 | 27 | 61.67 | 100 | 36.64 |

#### RStudio Test Scores

**Table 10:** Frequency Distribution and Summary of RStudio Test Scores for Gender

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Gender | Failed | Passed | Min | Mean | Max | SD |
| Female | 3 | 2 | 24 | 43.2 | 68 | 16.87 |
| Male | 0 | 3 | 61 | 73.33 | 86 | 12.5 |

### Having Previous Programming Experience

#### Technology Readiness Index Scores

**Table 11:** Summary of Technology Readiness Index Scores for Having Previous Programming Experience

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Experienced | Min | Mean | Max | SD |
| No | 2.7 | 2.95 | 3.1 | 0.19 |
| Yes | 2.7 | 2.98 | 3.4 | 0.31 |

#### Calculator Test Scores

**Table 12:** Frequency Distribution and Summary of Calculator Test Scores for Having Previous Programming Experience

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Experienced | Failed | Passed | Min | Mean | Max | SD |
| No | 2 | 2 | 27 | 54.25 | 100 | 32.5 |
| Yes | 3 | 1 | 25 | 38.25 | 58 | 15.44 |

#### RStudio Test Scores

**Table 13:** Frequency Distribution and Summary of RStudio Test Scores for Having Previous Programming Experience

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Experienced | Failed | Passed | Min | Mean | Max | SD |
| No | 2 | 2 | 35 | 52.5 | 86 | 23.39 |
| Yes | 1 | 3 | 24 | 56.5 | 73 | 22.22 |

### Statistical Computing Tool Preference: Calculator or RStudio

#### Technology Readiness Index Scores

**Table 14:** Summary of Technology Readiness Index for Statistical Computing Tool Preference

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Preference | Min | Mean | Max | SD |
| Calculator | 2.7 | 2.88 | 3.1 | 0.21 |
| RStudio | 2.8 | 3.05 | 3.4 | 0.26 |

#### Calculator Test Scores

**Table 15:** Frequency Distribution and Summary of Calculator Test Scores for Statistical Computing Tool Preference

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Preference | Failed | Passed | Min | Mean | Max | SD |
| Calculator | 3 | 1 | 25 | 48.75 | 100 | 35.1 |
| RStudio | 2 | 2 | 27 | 43.75 | 58 | 14.71 |

#### RStudio Test Scores

**Table 16:** Frequency Distribution and Summary of RStudio Test Scores for Statistical Computing Tool Preference

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Preference | Failed | Passed | Min | Mean | Max | SD |
| Calculator | 2 | 2 | 24 | 53.25 | 86 | 28.74 |
| RStudio | 1 | 3 | 38 | 55.75 | 73 | 14.86 |

## Significant Difference in the Technology Readiness Index Scores, the Calculator Test Scores, and the RStudio Test Scores of the Respondents When Grouped According to the Profile Variables

### Technology Readiness Index Scores

There are no significant difference.

### Calculator Test Scores

### RStudio Test Scores

The anova

Analysis of Variance Model

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Df | Sum Sq | Mean Sq | F value | Pr(>F) |
| **Gender** | 1 | 1703 | 1703 | 7.038 | 0.03788 |
| **Residuals** | 6 | 1451 | 241.9 | NA | NA |

The Mann-Whitney test

Wilcoxon rank sum test: Male and Female

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Test statistic | P value | Alternative hypothesis |
| 14 | 0.03571 \* | greater |

## Significant Relationship Between the Technology Readiness Index Scores and the RStudio Test Scores of the Respondents

### Calculator Test Scores and Age

The blah blah blah

Pearson’s product-moment correlation: CalcTest and Age

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Test statistic | df | P value | Alternative hypothesis | cor |
| 4.637 | 6 | 0.003552 \* \* | two.sided | 0.8842 |

And the blah blah blah
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