

Decision making in the classroom: when mathematics teaching and statistical reasoning meet each other

Munir Mahmood ^a, Lori L. Murray ^b, Ricardas Zitikis ^c, Ibtihal Mahmood ^d

^a Mathematics and Statistics Education Australia, Unit 1, 39 Moodemere Street, Noble Park, Victoria 3174, Australia

^b *King's University College at Western University, London, Ontario, N6A 2M3, Canada

^c School of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences, Western University, London, Ontario, N6A 5B7, Canada

^d University of Melbourne, Parkville 3052, Melbourne, Australia

Abstract

Zero factorial, defined to be one, is often counterintuitive to students but nonetheless an interesting concept to convey in a classroom environment. The challenge is to delineate the concept in a simple and effective way through the practice of justification, a familiar concept in mathematics and science education. In this regard, the contribution of this article is two-fold: First, it reveals and makes contribution to much simpler justifications on the notion of zero factorial to be one when compared to previous studies in the area. Second, to assess the effectiveness of the proposed justifications, an online survey has been conducted at a comprehensive university and, via its statistical analysis, data-driven instructional decision-making has been illustrated. Elaborating on the first contribution, we note that the connection of zero factorial to the definition of the gamma function provides a first-hand conceptual understanding of the concept of zero factorial. But for the purpose of teaching, it is not particularly helpful from the pedagogical point of view in early years of study, as it is quite challenging to explain the rationale behind the origin of the definite integral that defines the gamma function. In this regard two algebraic and one statistical justification are presented. The “squeeze theorem” plays a pivotal role in this article. To assess the effectiveness of the justifications pedagogically, an online survey was conducted at a Canadian university.

Introduction

Quite often in introductory courses, instructors emphasize learning concepts by means of repetition and ample practice problems. Sometimes, they simply provide students with cheat sheets. An allowed cheat sheet in the exam contains concise information used for quick reference. It becomes handy for items which are difficult to remember particularly at higher levels of education. Whether allowed or not, the preparation of such a sheet also serves as an educational exercise which motivates one to figure out what needs to be known, prioritize study items for the exam, help organize the required time allocation to study those items and finally provides an overall review before the exam day. While such practices are widely accepted and unavoidable, when time and class-size permit, some elements of mathematical fun (described as interactive learning involving activities conducted in the classroom) may be introduced to internalize those concepts [1]. This facilitates recovery of the concepts if students happen to forget their exact formulations. Another tool to facilitate internalization of concepts is to make them easier to remember by building a learning process by associating what needs to be learned with what has already been learned. For this task, the development of curricula plays a decisive role. In this regard, Chen and Zitikis [2, 3] have explored the effects of learning a subject due to prior subjects learned, based on real data and in-depth statistical analyses.

In this article we concentrate on a specific problem facing teachers in introductory calculus-related courses. Namely, we present three intuitive pedagogical justifications – all relying on the squeeze theorem – of why zero factorial (i.e., $0!$) is equal to 1, and not to 0 as many students would expect. Quite often when teaching introductory courses, students are merely instructed that zero factorial equals one as a fact for convenience and are not provided a methodical explanation as to why [4]. These justifications are either in addition to Mahmood and Mahmood [5] and Mahmood and Romdhane [6] or improved versions of them. It may be noted justification as a practice is in the heart of mathematics which may be regarded as one of the heuristic best practices, particularly when students learning and enhancing of their understanding of mathematics concepts are involved. In this regard Staples, Bartlo and Thanheiser [7] gives an excellent account of justification as a practice in providing several ways to reach every student as it offers and enables differentiated paths of learning. Having several choices is useful for selecting a most suitable one for the level and perceived inclinations of a given group of students

[8]. Based on a survey conducted at a comprehensive university, we illustrate how data and their statistical analysis can facilitate the selection.

In general, surveys have played a particularly important role in educational decision making, and one of the most researched databases is the OECD Education Statistics. On a smaller, localized scale, educational researchers have conducted surveys on issues such as the impact of active learning in undergraduate Science, technology, engineering, mathematics, and medicine (STEMM) education (for example Wiggins et al. [9]), assessment design (Murray & Wilson, [10]), students' views on introductory Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) courses (Meaders et al., [11]), and experiential learning perspectives (Zhai et al., [12]). A well-designed survey is crucial in achieving statistically sound and trustworthy results [13-15]. The focus of the survey in the present paper is quite distinct: we aim not at general instructional matters but at a very specific mathematical concept and, given several alternatives, at choosing a most accessible way to present the concept in a classroom environment.

There are many ad hoc explanations of why zero factorial equals one, and arguments ensue whether, and to what extent, they can be considered mathematically accurate. Obviously, for the sake of facilitating intuition, at least during the first stages of explanation, we are bound to slightly depart from rigor, which could later be, and is, re-stored via the celebrated gamma function in more advanced calculus courses. It should be noted at this point, however, that there is no simple way to express the factorial function $h(n) = n!$ beyond the positive integers n , and thus to reveal its value at $n = 0$. In particular, for the sole purpose of conveying a meaningful concept of the zero factorial, a simpler approximation to the integral form of the gamma function to date is unavailable. Hence it is desirable to derive or present a formula that would transition the factorial function for positive integer values to non-integer values, particularly to those that are in the interval $(0,1)$, and then approach 0 along the curve.

As we have noted earlier, in more advanced calculus courses, this goal is effectively achieved via the well-known gamma function, which is $\Gamma(t) = \int_0^{\infty} x^{t-1} e^{-x} dx$ for all real $t > 0$. For details, see Devore [16]. The relationship $\Gamma(n + 1) = n\Gamma(n) = n!$ between the gamma and factorial functions, and the equation $\Gamma(t + 1) = t\Gamma(t)$ that holds for all $t \in (0, 1)$, create a genuine bridge between the cases $n = 1$ and $n = 0$. Intuitively, if we take the limit as $t \downarrow 0$ inside the integral $\int_0^{\infty} x^t e^{-x} dx$, and all limits in this paper approach 0 from the right, we are left with the exponential function, which integrates to 1. This shows that $\Gamma(t + 1)$ converges to 1

when $t \downarrow 0$. Defining $0!$ as the limit of $\Gamma(t + 1)$ when $t \downarrow 0$, we can now claim that $0!$ is indeed equal to 1. This explanation supports the presentations of $0! = 1$ in [5, 6] although it is not explicitly mentioned in those articles.

The aim of this article is to seek further simplified algebraic and statistical justifications and then let survey data choose the “best” one ranking them. The “best” is of course contingent on the university and the type of students, but given the prerequisites for enrolling into courses, the notion of ‘best’ would carry on for a given course for several years after the survey results. Such availability of the choicest justification addresses and serves the essential purpose of effective understanding of zero factorial in classes that may not have yet encountered the concept of the gamma function, or may have seen it in other contexts such as statistics but have not associated it with real numbers other than positive integers. In this regard, we acknowledge to have greatly benefited from historical notes of Hairer and Wanner [17] on the gamma function, factorials and Euler’s interest and achievements in interpolating factorials to non-integer values. Of course, the use of the gamma function would give the most mathematically rigorous justification of $0! = 1$, whereas [5, 6] presented particularly an intuitive explanation. The justifications in the current paper slightly reduces the intuitive appeal but adds more mathematical rigor to the justification of $0! = 1$, hence exhibiting the delicate balance that we desire to achieve in a classroom setting when explaining new concepts to students. The issue is that the presence of the definite integral of the gamma function presents a tricky form, one which is not easy to absorb by students at such an early exposure stage of the concepts of n factorial and zero factorial. Moreover, it is hard to explain the rationale behind the basis of such an integral in t and x , of which t ascertains the factorial calculation while the embedded exponential function assures the definite integral to produce the aim of any given factorial value.

To facilitate our following arguments in a gentle and intuitive fashion, a symbolic $t!$ is introduced in the next section, which allows movement from the discrete to the continuous in $t \in (0, 1)$. This enables taking the limits in a subtle way, aligning more with the gamma function but avoiding its extreme mathematical precision and thus its complexity.

Materials and Methods

The factorial of n is defined by

$$n! = n \cdot (n - 1) \cdot \dots \cdot 3 \cdot 2 \cdot 1 \tag{1}$$

for integer $n \geq 1$, but for $n = 0$, zero factorial, symbolically written as $0!$, is defined as $0! = 1$.

In this section we present some easier justifications of $0! = 1$, in light of Section 1, and which of them is the “best” will then be decided by a data-driven statistical analysis in Section 3. As already noted earlier, all justifications will rely on the squeeze theorem from Adams and Essex (1996, pp. 70–71), which is restated below.

The Squeeze Theorem: If for three functions f , g , and h we have the relationship $f(t) \leq g(t) \leq h(t)$ for all t in some open interval containing t_0 , except possibly at $t = t_0$, and if $f(t)$ and $h(t)$ have the same limit, say L , when t approaches t_0 , then $g(t)$ also has the same limit L when t approaches t_0 .

In the following justifications, we shall have various functions f , g , and h , with $t_0 = 0$ and $L = 1$ in all of them.

Justification 1:

Restating from Mahmood and Mahmood (2015), a lower bound for $n!$ is given by $1 = 1^n = 1 \cdot 1 \cdot \dots \cdot 1 \cdot 1 \cdot 1 \leq n!$ whereas we now propose using the following lower bound

$$\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^{n/2} \leq n!. \quad (2)$$

We can prove bound (2) as follows. Let k be the (unique) positive integer such that $k - 1 \leq \frac{n}{2} < k$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} n! &= n \cdot \dots \cdot k \cdot \dots \cdot 2 \cdot 1 \\ &\geq n \cdot \dots \cdot k \\ &\geq k^{n-k+1} \\ &\geq \left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^{n/2} \end{aligned}$$

where the right-most inequality holds because $n - k + 1 \geq \frac{n}{2}$ due to $\frac{n}{2} \geq k - 1$, with $k > \frac{n}{2}$.

This completes the proof of bound (2).

Further, it was noted that an upper bound for $n!$ follows from

$$n! \leq n \cdot n \cdot \dots \cdot n \cdot n \cdot n = n^n. \quad (3)$$

To avoid the application of l'Hospital's Rule to demonstrate $0! = 1$ of Mahmood and Mahmood (2015), we next propose the following upper bound

$$n^n \leq 2^{n^2}, \tag{4}$$

which is valid since $n < 2^n$. The information conveyed in statements (1) to (4) establishes the inequalities

$$\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^{n/2} \leq n! \leq 2^{n^2}. \tag{5}$$

The above inequalities are correct for positive integers, but we wish to see where they take us when n goes to 0. Recall, however, that n is a positive integer, and thus limits such as $n \rightarrow 0$ do not make sense. Hence, we build a bridge via a parameter $t \in (0, 1)$ and a symbolic $t!$, which is merely a function of t squeezed between $\left(\frac{t}{2}\right)^{t/2}$ and 2^{t^2} . Thus, we write the inequalities

$$\left(\frac{t}{2}\right)^{t/2} \leq t! \leq 2^{t^2}. \tag{6}$$

The left- and right-hand sides of (6) converge to 1 when $t \downarrow 0$. Hence as a consequence of the squeeze (or “two policemen and a drunk”) theorem, defining $0!$ as the limit of $t!$ when $t \downarrow 0$, we conclude that $0! = 1$. Figure 1 visualizes these arguments by depicting the lower bound

$a(t) = \left(\frac{t}{2}\right)^{t/2}$, the upper bound $b(t) = 2^{t^2}$, the symbolic $t! \equiv \text{factorial}(t)$ drawn in a wiggly way we would depict on the whiteboard in a classroom set up, along with the Euler's factorial or gamma function $\Gamma(t + 1)$ when $t \in (0, 1)$.




Fig 1. Pictorial summary of Justification 1 with the curves $a(t)$ (red), $b(t)$ (blue), symbolic $t!$ (green), and $\Gamma(t + 1)$ (black).

Justification 2:

We bypass the rigorous presentation of using l'Hospital's Rule and the harmonic mean (*HM*) of [6] in order to arrive at zero factorial to be one. Applying the well-known inequality $GM \leq AM$ to the set $\{1, 2, 3, \dots, n\}$, where GM and AM are the geometric and arithmetic means, gives the bound

$$(1 \cdot 2 \cdot \dots \cdot n)^{1/n} \leq \frac{1+2+\dots+n}{n}. \quad (7)$$

Expressing the left-hand term of (7) by the n factorial notation given by (1) and also using the equation $1 + 2 + \dots + n = \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$, it is clear that

$$1 \leq n! \leq \left(\frac{n+1}{2}\right)^n. \quad (8)$$

Again, these bounds are valid for positive integers, but we wish to have a bridge that connects $n = 1$ with $n = 0$, and thus we again rely on the symbolic $t!$ for all $t \in (0, 1)$. Accordingly, we write the inequalities

$$\left(\frac{t+1}{2}\right)^t \leq t! \leq 1. \quad (9)$$

Remark 1: The inequalities in (8) are true for $n \geq 1$, but when t is in $(0, 1)$, the two “policemen” interchange their sides as noted by the inequalities in (9), keeping the “drunk”, which is $t!$, still between themselves.

The left-hand side of (9) converges to 1 when $t \downarrow 0$, and so by the squeeze theorem and following the definition of $0!$ as the limit of $t!$ when $t \downarrow 0$, we conclude the equation $0! = 1$ from (9).

Figure 2 visualizes the above arguments by presenting $a(t) = \left(\frac{t+1}{2}\right)^t$, $b(t) = 1$, the symbolic $t!$, and the Euler’s gamma function $\Gamma(t + 1)$ for $t \in (0, 1)$.




Fig 2. Pictorial summary of Justification 2 with the curves $a(t)$ (red), $b(t)$ (blue), symbolic $t!$ (green), and $\Gamma(t + 1)$ (black).

Justification 3:

Consider now a random variable X that follows the exponential distribution with rate $\lambda = 1$, that is, its mean is $E[X] = 1$ and the probability density function is given by

$$f(x) = e^{-x} \tag{10}$$

for $x > 0$. For details of the exponential distribution, see [16]. The n -th moment of X is

$$E[X^n] = \int_0^\infty x^n f(x) dx = \int_0^\infty x^n e^{-x} dx = n!, \tag{11}$$

that is, $n! = E[X^n]$.

We now again create a bridge between $n = 1$ and $n = 0$ by introducing bounds $a(t)$ and $b(t)$ such that $a(t) \leq E[X^t] \leq b(t)$ for $t \in (0, 1)$. We start with an upper bound. For any concave function $g(x)$, the Jensen's inequality states that

$$E[g(X)] \leq g[E(X)]. \quad (13)$$

Applying this inequality for the concave function $g(x) = x^t$ for any $t \in (0, 1)$ yields

$$E[X^t] \leq [E(X)]^t = 1^t = 1. \quad (14)$$

Therefore, $b(t) = 1$. We next find a lower bound $a(t)$. We have

$$E[X^t] = \int_0^\infty e^{-x^{1/t}} dx \geq \int_0^1 e^{-x^{1/t}} dx \geq \int_0^1 (1 - x^{1/t}) dx$$

because $e^{-\theta} \geq 1 - \theta$ for every $\theta \geq 0$, and in our case $\theta = x^{1/t}$. Hence,

$$E[X^t] \geq 1 - \int_0^1 x^{1/t} dx = 1 - \frac{1}{1+\frac{1}{t}} = \frac{1}{1+t}$$

and so $a(t) = \frac{1}{1+t}$. In summary, we have

$$\frac{1}{1+t} \leq E[X^t] \leq 1 \quad (15)$$

and thus whatever the graph of symbolic $t!$ we may wish to draw on the classroom whiteboard, it must satisfy the bound

$$\frac{1}{1+t} \leq t! \leq 1. \quad (16)$$

Since the left-hand side of bound (15) converges to 1 when $t \downarrow 0$, we conclude that the limit of $t!$ when $t \downarrow 0$, which is by definition equal to $0!$, must be equal to 1.

Figure 3 visualizes $a(t) = \frac{1}{1+t}$, $b(t) = 1$, the symbolic $t!$ in a wiggly way we would draw on the classroom whiteboard, and the gamma function $\Gamma(t + 1)$ for $t \in (0, 1)$.




Fig 3. Pictorial summary of Justification 3 with the curves $a(t)$ (red), $b(t)$ (blue), symbolic $t!$ (green), and $\Gamma(t + 1)$ (black).

Evaluation of justifications: Let data speak

To assess the effectiveness of the three justifications pedagogically, a class presentation (Appendix) and an online survey were implemented. Sixty-four undergraduate students enrolled in an introductory statistics course majoring in mathematics, finance, and economics at a Canadian university were invited to participate in the study. Approval for this study was obtained from the King’s University College Research Ethics Review Committee.

To accommodate the varying levels of student abilities with differing backgrounds, the justifications, as they are presented in Section 2, were modified accordingly. For example, the gamma function in Figure 1 was removed as shown in the presentation slides in the Appendix. This was to ensure that all students invited to participate in the study would have the foundational knowledge and calibre to identify and understand the mathematics described in the presentation without compromising the study objective.

Students were asked to complete an online survey using five response categories (strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, strongly disagree) in the form of statements of which statement 0 was asked prior to the presentation and statements 1a to 4 were asked after the presentation. The statements are given as follows:

0. *Zero factorial equals one (i.e., $0! = 1$) is believable.*

- 1a. *The explanation of symbolic $t!$ in Justification 1 is helpful.*
- 1b. *The pictorial summary of Justification 1 by the graph on slide 5 aided further to conceptualize $0!$ to be 1.*
- 1c. *Justification 1 is helpful in believing that $0!=1$*
- 2a. *The explanation of symbolic $t!$ in Justification 2 is helpful.*
- 2b. *The pictorial summary of Justification 2 by the graph on slide 5 aided further to conceptualize $0!$ to be 1.*
- 2c. *Justification 2 is helpful in believing that $0!=1$*
- 3a. *The explanation of symbolic $t!$ in Justification 3 is helpful.*
- 3b. *The pictorial summary of Justification 3 by the graph on slide 5 aided further to conceptualize $0!$ to be 1.*
- 3c. *Justification 3 is helpful in believing that $0!=1$*
4. *Overall, the statement that zero factorial equals one (i.e., $0! = 1$) is more believable after having read the justifications.*

Results

A summary of the data gathered from the online survey are shown in Tables 1 to 4. Table 1 shows the counts and percentages for the statement “*the explanation of symbolic $t!$ is helpful*” for each justification. The aggregate counts for the categories “strongly agree” and “somewhat agree” are 55/62 (88.71%), 51/62 (82.26%), and 45/62 (72.85%) for the three justifications respectively, and indicate that the explanation of symbolic $t!$ is the most helpful in Justification 1. Table 2 shows the counts and percentages for the statement “*the pictorial summary by the graph aided further to conceptualize $0!$ to be 1*” for each justification. The aggregate counts for “strongly agree” and “somewhat agree” are 57/62 (91.94%), 57/62 (91.94%), and 51/62 (82.26%) for the three justifications respectively, and indicate that the graphs used in Justifications 1 and 2 are the most helpful. Table 3 shows the counts and percentages for the statement “*justification is helpful in believing that $0! = 1$* ” for each justification. The aggregate counts for the categories “strongly agree” and “somewhat agree” are 53/62 (85.48%), 49/62 (79.03%), and 44/62 (70.97%) for the three justifications respectively, and indicate that Justification 1 is the most helpful in believing that zero factorial equals one. We have to be mindful, however, of the lurking framing effect, which could have made Justification 1 preferred due to its first place in the survey, although we believe that its pronounced simplicity must have

made it more attractive to the majority of students. We note that out of 64 students there were at least 62 responses for all statements, reflecting a response rate of 96.88% approximately.

Table 4 shows the counts and percentages for the pre- and post-presentation statements “*zero factorial equals one (i.e., $0! = 1$) is believable*”, and “*overall, the statement that zero factorial equals one (i.e., $0! = 1$) is more believable after having read the justifications*”, respectively. The aggregate counts for the categories “strongly agree” and “somewhat agree” are 55/64 (85.94%) for statement 0, and 59/62 (95.15%) for statement 4, an increase of 9.21%. Most notably, the counts for the category “strongly agree” for the pre- and post-presentation statements has an increase of 16.02%. A striking difference observed (in the category “neither agree nor disagree”) between the counts for the pre- and post-presentation statements are from 4 to 0 results which in percentages from 6.25% to 0% respectively. This attests to the scenario of those 4 students who could not conclusively make a decision of their understanding from any of the Justifications 1 through 3, are now being able to decide on their preferences from the other four progressively decisive categories. The percentage of students on the fence (neither agree nor disagree), somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree for the pre-presentation statement is 9/64 (14.1%) and 3/62 (4.8%) for the post-presentation statement.

A matched-pairs t -test was conducted to see if there was an improvement in the responses between the pre- and post-presentation statements, ie. before – after < 0 . Using the survey data collected from the students that responded to both statements ($n = 62$), the students’ individual responses for each statement were assigned numerical values: strongly agree = 5, somewhat agree = 4, neither agree nor disagree = 3, somewhat disagree = 2, and strongly disagree = 1. The result of the test is statistically significant (p -value = 0.008). The results provide strong evidence that the justifications are helpful in believing that zero factorial equals one.

Table 1: Survey response summaries for the statement “*the explanation of symbolic $t!$ is helpful*” (Statements 1a, 2a, and 3a) for the three justifications.

Response	Justification 1		Justification 2		Justification 3	
	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count
Strongly agree	33.87%	21	33.87%	21	32.26%	20
Somewhat agree	54.84%	34	48.39%	30	40.32%	25
Neither agree nor disagree	8.06%	5	14.52%	9	12.90%	8
Somewhat disagree	1.61%	1	1.61%	1	11.29%	7
Strongly disagree	1.61%	1	1.61%	1	3.23%	2

Table 2: Survey response summaries for the statement “*the pictorial summary by the graph aided further to conceptualize $0!$ to be 1 ”* (Statements 1b, 2b and 3b) for the three justifications.

Response	Justification 1		Justification 2		Justification 3	
	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count
Strongly agree	38.71%	24	45.16%	28	43.55%	27
Somewhat agree	53.23%	33	46.77%	29	38.71%	24
Neither agree nor disagree	4.84%	3	6.45%	4	11.29%	7
Somewhat disagree	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	3.23%	2
Strongly disagree	3.23%	2	1.61%	1	3.23%	2

Table 3: Survey response summaries for the statement “*justification is helpful in believing that $0! = 1$* ” (Statements 1c, 2c, and 3c) for the three justifications.

Response	Justification 1		Justification 2		Justification 3	
	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count
Strongly agree	45.16%	28	43.55%	27	35.48%	22
Somewhat agree	40.32%	25	35.48%	22	35.48%	22
Neither agree nor disagree	8.06%	5	14.52%	9	17.74%	11
Somewhat disagree	4.84%	3	4.84%	3	8.06%	5
Strongly disagree	1.61%	1	1.61%	1	3.23%	2

Table 4: Survey response summaries for the pre- and post-presentation statements “*zero factorial equals one (i.e., $0! = 1$) is believable*” (Statement 0), and “*overall, the statement that zero factorial equals one (i.e., $0! = 1$) is more believable after having read the justifications*” (Statement 4).

Pre-presentation statement (Statement 0)		
Response	Percentage	Count
Strongly agree	46.88%	30
Somewhat agree	39.06%	25
Neither agree nor disagree	6.25%	4
Somewhat disagree	3.13%	2
Strongly disagree	4.69%	3
Post-presentation statement (Statement 4)		
Response	Percentage	Count
Strongly agree	62.90%	39
Somewhat agree	32.26%	20
Neither agree nor disagree	0.00%	0
Somewhat disagree	3.23%	2
Strongly disagree	1.61%	1

Discussion

In this paper we have provided three simple and illuminating instructional justifications for zero factorial to be equal to one. In view of the evidence from the survey results, the explanations exhibited the twin goals of addressing an accessible way for all students of revealing that zero factorial is convincingly equal to one while for a range of students providing the rationale for rectifying the perception that zero factorial should be zero. The analysis of the pre- and post-presentation statements have clearly indicated that the justifications are useful in believing that zero factorial equals one.

Overall, the results from the online survey have shown that the students preferred Justification 1. We note that the order of the justifications in which they are presented can be very influential. For instance, the first justification may have convinced many students that zero factorial equals one, and thus, subsequent justifications scored lower. Another possible reason that Justification 1 was preferred is that it is the most straightforward and may have been the most convincing for students with a weaker mathematical background.

Justification 3 is the best in terms of mathematical rigor, yet it scored lowest in the survey, whereas Justification 1, which scored highest, is the easiest to assimilate but not necessarily the best in terms of mathematical merit. This observation highlights the already made note that the use of the gamma function when teaching statistics at such an early stage is not particularly welcome on pedagogical grounds. Yet, working with the binomial distribution and thus, inevitably, with factorials of all non-negative integers (including zero) is necessary.

The appeal of any preferred justification depends on the ability to engage productively based on cognitive skills, acumen and understanding of a given group of students. Having several justifications thus provides a way to meet the educational needs of all students. Inclusive approaches to education have become more prevalent and “psychologists, counsellors, educators, and researchers must critically examine interventions for students with unique educational needs” [8].

From the perspective of enriching learning with instructional value driven by survey data, particularly on a special topic, which has a natural counterintuitive connotation, the research undertaken via the three alternative justifications in this article, is new to the best of our knowledge.

Conclusions

The results of our study may help instructors of various courses to convey the somewhat counterintuitive fact that “zero factorial equals 1” more clearly. Additionally, students’ learning may be facilitated by instructors who apply our justifications in their teaching. Finally, with our research and statistical analysis, we have illustrated the role of statistical thinking and techniques when making instructional choices.

Acknowledgements

We thank Rashdan Mahmood of Keysborough College, Victoria, Australia, and Noah Laskey of King's University College at Western University, London, Canada, for careful reading of the manuscript and providing valuable suggestions.

References

1. Roberts T, Jackson C, Mohr-Schroeder MJ, Bush SB, Maiorca C, Cavalcanti M, et al. Students’ perceptions of STEM learning after participating in a summer informal learning experience. *International Journal of STEM Education*. 2018;5. doi: 10.1186/s40594-018-0133-4
2. Chen L and Zitikis R. Measuring and comparing student performance: a new technique for assessing directional associations. *Education Sciences*. 2017;7. doi: 10.3390/educsci7040077
3. Chen L and Zitikis R. Quantifying and analyzing nonlinear relationships with a fresh look at a classical dataset of student scores. *Quality & Quantity: International Journal of Methodology*. 2020;54: 1145-1169.
4. Buglear J and Castell A. *Stats Means Business: Statistics and Business Analytics for Business, Hospitality and Tourism*. Routledge, New York; 2019.
5. Mahmood M and Mahmood I. A simple demonstration of zero factorial equals one. *International Journal of Mathematical Education in Science and Technology*. 2015;47: 959-960.
6. Mahmood M and Romdhane MB. An algebraic justification that zero factorial equals one. *The Mathematical Scientist*. 2015;40: 134-135.
7. Staples ME, Bartlo J, Thanheiser E. Justification as a teaching and learning practice: Its (potential) multifaceted role in middle grades mathematics classrooms. *The Journal of Mathematical Behavior*. 2012;31. doi: 10.1016/j.jmathb.2012.07.001
8. Dare L, Nowicki E, and Murray LL. How students conceptualize grade-based acceleration in inclusive settings. *Psychology in the Schools*. 2021;58: 33-50. doi: 10.1002/pits.22435
9. Wiggins BL, Eddy SL, Wener-Fligner L, Freisem K, Grunspan DZ, Theobald EJ, et al. ASPECT: A survey to assess student perspective of engagement in an active-learning classroom. *Life Sciences Education*. 2017;16. doi: 10.1187/cbe.16-08-0244

10. Murray LL and Wilson JG. Generating data sets for teaching the importance of regression analysis. *Decision Sciences: Journal of Innovative Education (DSJIE)*. 2021;19: 157-166. doi: 10.1111/dsji.12233
11. Meaders CL, Lane AK, Morozov AI, Shuman JK, Toth ES, Stains M, et al. Undergraduate student concerns in introductory STEM courses: what they are, how they change, and what influences them. *Journal for STEM Education Research*. 2020;2: 195–216. doi: 10.1007/s41979-020-00031-1
12. Zhai X, Gu J, Liu H, Liang JC, and Tsai CC. An experiential learning perspective on students' satisfaction model in a flipped classroom context. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*. 2017;20: 198-210. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/jeductechsoci.20.1.198>
13. Bellhouse DR. A review of optimal designs in survey sampling. *Canadian Journal of Statistics*. 1984;12: 53 – 65.
14. Thompson ME. *Theory of Sample Surveys*. Chapman and Hall, London, UK; 1997.
15. Wu C and Thompson ME. *Sampling Theory and Practice*. Springer, New York; 2020.
16. Devore JL. *Probability and Statistics for Engineering and the Sciences*. Canada: Brooks/Cole, Cengage Learning; 2012.
17. Hairer E and Wanner G. *Analysis by Its History*. Readings in Mathematics, Springer, New York; 1996.
18. Adams RA and Essex C. *Calculus: A Complete Course*. (Ninth Edition). Pearson Canada, Don Mills, Ontario; 2010.