

Review of: "Assessing students' attitudes and perceptions towards statistical literacy in a university system in a developing African country"

Rosnani Hashim

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The introduction is appropriate in giving a little background of the problem and the three objectives of the study. However, it would have been better if the article defined what it means by statistical education and its context more deeply than just a sentence.

In Methods, there is no necessity of providing Figure 1 to show the campus. Better to give just the map of Zimbabwe in the context of its location in Africa. In fact, the research methods should begin with a research design and the justifications of the choice of methodology and instrument. Section 2.2 should be Research Design, which includes the sample or subjects of the study and the instrument. In this article, there is no such justification. The instrument that was employed, SATS 36, should be described more clearly regarding what its items and components are and its source. The sample comprised 185 **conventional and block** undergraduate and postgraduate students drawn from all schools. What are these?

Section 2.3 is good and clear. Perhaps a table for demography will help readers understand the profiles of the respondents more clearly and faster to capture. In the analysis of the results, the article did not explain how the three objectives would be analysed in its preface. How did it come up with these 6 factors or subthemes: attitudes toward statistics, statistics cognitive competence, efforts, values and use of statistics, difficulties in statistics, and interest in statistics. Are these the components in SATS 36? It is only after reaching Table 7 that readers will realize that these are the content of the instrument. The review of literature was clear on the attitudes toward statistics but not so on the others. Does Section 3.1 answer Research Objectives 1 and 2?

How were the results of sections 3.3 and 3.4 obtained? Were they obtained from the data on the SATS 36, interviews, or the focus group discussions? This has to be clear.

Do sections 3.5 and 4 answer Research Objective 3 to develop a framework to improve delivery modes in statistics education? Figure 2 on the framework is commendable.

Overall, the article is good and recommended for publication, but it would be better if the way it is presented could be improved based on the comments above. I would emphasise the importance of writing to help readers follow the discussion by having a proper introduction to each section and not having gaps leaving readers wondering.

Reviewer

Dr. Rosnani Hashim

Independent Scholar, Formerly Professor, Faculty of Education

International Islamic University Malaysia

22nd January 2024