

where, $X = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_m)$ is an observed random vector; a_{ij} is the factor weighting; F_1 is a common factor of X ; and ε_i is the special factor of X_i . In principal component analysis $q < m$ principal factors are selected to maintain the original information as much as possible. Each principal factor can be expressed as a linear combination of the variables. Then, the value of each of the main factors can be calculated using the observed variables [4].

IMPACT OF THE CHALLENGE CUP ENGINEERING PROJECT ON THE INNOVATIVE ABILITY OF ENGINEERING MAJOR STUDENTS

A questionnaire study was conducted of a sample of engineering major students at Liaoning University of Technology. In total, 1,000 questionnaires were distributed, and 930 or 93% returned. The 930 returned questionnaires were all valid. Analysis of the results revealed that the main factors, which affect the innovative ability of engineering students in the project were: X_1 - participation in the Challenge Cup engineering project; X_2 - future development; X_3 - Challenge Cup spirit; X_4 - results of the Challenge Cup engineering project; X_5 - business conditions; X_6 - teamwork; X_7 - value of the application and practical significance; X_8 - practical ability during the project; X_9 - teachers' guidance; X_{10} - feasibility and innovation; X_{11} - importance of the participants; X_{12} - attitude towards finishing and word processing capability; X_{13} - support from senior students; X_{14} - awareness of innovation and feasibility in the choice of topic. The details are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Analysis on factors affecting the engineering students' innovative ability.

	X_1	X_2	X_3	X_4	X_5	X_6	X_7	X_8	X_9	X_{10}	X_{11}	X_{12}	X_{13}	X_{14}
Great emphasis	23.22	18.16	29.46	12.80	22.27	20.90	11.40	36.10	20.90	22.50	25.60	28.20	24.60	40.40
Some emphasis	33.21	45.10	32.52	20.56	33.25	37.20	30.40	18.40	31.20	25.60	21.40	18.60	23.50	18.50
General importance	27.53	17.60	22.89	35.33	8.63	25.60	32.50	19.50	22.80	17.30	11.20	22.50	16.50	23.80
Less emphasis	6.21	11.20	12.33	8.56	22.30	11.80	10.40	22.80	16.50	11.20	22.30	15.90	22.30	6.90
Downplayed	9.33	5.44	2.65	10.25	11.25	4.50	14.50	3.20	8.60	21.20	14.30	11.30	11.60	8.60
No answer	0.50	2.50	0.33	12.50	2.30	0	0.80	0	0	2.20	5.20	3.50	1.50	1.80
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Note: The actual number of surveys handed out was 1,000. The number of valid answers to the questionnaire was 930.

The 14 fixed order variables in Table 1 would be transformed into fixed pitch variables. The usual practice is to consider the various codes as the value of these fixed order variables. Supposing that,

$$X_i \begin{cases} 1 & \text{The } i^{\text{th}} \text{ is great emphasis} \\ 2 & \text{The } i^{\text{th}} \text{ some emphasis} \\ 3 & \text{The } i^{\text{th}} \text{ general importance} \\ 4 & \text{The } i^{\text{th}} \text{ less emphasis} \\ 5 & \text{The } i^{\text{th}} \text{ downplayed} \\ 6 & \text{The } i^{\text{th}} \text{ no answer} \end{cases}$$

First, the correlation matrix of variables is determined and, then, characteristic values and eigenvectors of this matrix are calculated. Then, a factor loading matrix would be developed and a varimax orthogonal rotation performed. The final results matrix is shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Orthogonal factors.

	Component			Extraction
	1	2	3	
X_1	0.810	0.385	0.416	0.977
X_2	0.645	0.717	0.100	0.940
X_3	0.576	0.509	0.600	0.951
X_4	0.927	-0.299	0.145	0.970
X_5	0.148	0.952	0.256	0.994
X_6	0.755	0.541	0.340	0.978

X ₇	0.921	0.256	0.112	0.925
X ₈	0.089	0.375	0.895	0.949
X ₉	0.648	0.618	0.424	0.982
X ₁₀	0.451	0.574	0.390	0.684
X ₁₁	-0.132	0.777	0.607	0.989
X ₁₂	0.363	0.278	0.884	0.990
X ₁₃	0.196	0.709	0.635	0.945
X ₁₄	0.315	0.120	0.898	0.920
Cumulative (%)	49.274	65.392	74.246	

Note: the joint degree is to describe the contribution of total variance towards some indicator from all the main factors.

The 14 indicators are divided into three categories according to the loadings and the main factors named as below.

Based on the impacts of the Challenge Cup engineering project on the innovative ability of engineering students, the cumulative variance contribution of the main factors is greater than or equal to 70%. All data were processed using SPSS 19.0 software.

The correlation matrix of variables was found using SPSS 19.0. First, one needs to precede as per the three steps above and, then, by using the factors in the analysis of the questionnaire, the cumulative variance contribution of the main factor is 74.25%, which reaches the level set in the quantitative analysis of $\geq 70\%$. The situation of the joint degree, for which a description of the information of some indicator is reflected by all the main factors, is similar to that of the main factor.

The first main factor F₁ has larger loadings for X₁, X₄, X₆ and X₇. These deal with attitude, the result and the work and the impact of the project on participants. Thus, F₁ can be named the *value factor* of the Challenge Cup engineering project. The second main factor F₂ has larger loadings for X₂, X₅, X₁₁ and X₁₃, which reflect the business conditions, and therefore F₂ is the *entrepreneurial factor*. The third main factor F₃ has greater loadings for X₈, X₁₂ and X₁₄, which relate to practical ability, the attitude towards finishing, word processing capability, and the awareness of innovation and feasibility in the choice of topic. Thus, F₃ can be named the *capacity factor*. The value factor, the entrepreneurial factor, and the capacity factor are, in order, the three main factors for participants in the Challenge Cup engineering project.

Among the 14 X_i factors, attitude to participation, the results and the value of the work are the primary factors. This is followed by the entrepreneurial conditions and, then, practical ability, the attitude towards finishing, word processing capability and the awareness of innovation and feasibility in the choice of topic.

PROBLEMS IN TRAINING ENGINEERING STUDENTS TO INNOVATE

From the analysis of the questionnaire results using SPSS 19.0, the following problems were identified.

Low participation rate: of the 930 students, 25% participated in the Challenge Cup, and the other 75% did not. Among those, 91% are willing to participate next year. However, some engineering students limit their topics just to the major they study and some topics are not creative enough, since conclusions are available in textbooks. So, it is challenging for them to address a topic with substantial content.

In addition, they do not have enough practical knowledge and engineering background to select an appropriate and challenging topic yet. These often cause them to either not be able to hand in their work on time or fail in the first round of the engineering project. In short, students are very interested in the Challenge Cup engineering project, but their limited knowledge holds them back from participation.

Limited ways to acquire information: 73.7% of the students contacted their product suppliers on-line and 26.3% contacted suppliers in other ways. Of the students, 45% heard about the Challenge Cup engineering project through the University's promotion; 28.8% heard of it from their teachers or from fellow students; and 26.2% of the students had not heard about the Challenge Cup project at all.

Building a team is hard: because individual students have different goals and backgrounds, there are some difficulties in finding partners and building an effective team to join the project. From the analysis, most of the students look for teammates from among their fellow classmates. Of the students, 58.3% believe that consensus among the team members is most important. However, in this way, it is difficult to build a multidisciplinary team, which often leads to a narrow view of their topic.

Tutors' guidance is imperfect: among the students who participated in the Challenge Cup engineering project, 6.3% received no help or guidance from their advisors; 36.3% of them had mentorship assistance one or two times; 46.3% of them received guidance three or four times; and only 11.3% received help from their tutors more than four times. Of the 50 university teachers involved in the survey, 90% said that they provided technical guidance and expertise; 8%

considered that they shared some experiences; and only 2% of the teachers said they offered a lot of guidance to their students.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING ENGINEERING STUDENTS' INNOVATIVE ABILITY

Set clear goals and values: cultivation of innovative talent is a process of seeking truth from facts, in which students are expected to continuously solve difficult problems to achieve their goals. The Challenge Cup engineering project aims to ...*guide and encourage engineering students to seek truth, be assiduous and innovative, to achieve more for both their professional and personal goals.* Therefore, the ideology that ...*participation and enjoyment from the process in the project is more important than results, and the project aims to promote the cultivation of innovative talents* should be established. Positive life values for engineering students should be developed, as well as a correct righteousness and ethical evaluation criteria applied [5]. Thus, they could regulate their innovative behaviours using these evaluation criteria.

Increase knowledge of the Challenge Cup: through various channels, such as radio, and Blackboard (product of Blackboard Inc.) advertisements, students could learn more about the time and purpose of the Challenge Cup engineering project. This should stress the important role of the Challenge Cup engineering project in improving their innovative ability. Students should be assisted in contacting product suppliers and obtaining technical support, and it should be made easier for students to join the project.

Integrate curricula teaching with engineering projects: innovation-oriented activities provide a platform for cultivating engineering students' innovative ability. Through participation in innovation-oriented activities, the students could improve their ability to use statistical analysis methods and to write scientific research papers. In daily teaching, teachers could cover more engineering knowledge related to the project, and they could combine theory and practice. Thus, the development of the students' abilities for analysing, solving problems, critical thinking and word processing skills could be accelerated. In addition, teachers should be encouraged to set up specific courses, to systematically teach students the knowledge and methods related to innovation-oriented activities to develop their innovative skills and abilities [6].

Strengthen team building: universities should select and train a group of responsible teachers to be involved in guiding students in the Challenge Cup engineering project. Teachers should give guidance on key milestones, such as selecting the topic, researching the context, adopting scientific methods and writing the report. Students' team-building should be enhanced by putting students with different strengths and backgrounds together to build an effective, multidisciplinary team. During the project, team members could learn from each other and research the topic together, which will help to create a productive environment for innovation [7].

Establishment of a guaranteed funding system: first, the guarantee system for funding should be improved. It should provide adequate funding for students' innovative activities through the establishment of the fund, the university's financial support and sponsorships [8]. Second, sufficient test sites should be provided. A variety of laboratories and equipment should be available for innovative activities. Third, the mechanism of evaluation and encouragement should be perfected. Benefits, such as scholarships could be provided to the engineering students who gained awards in the Challenge Cup engineering project. Award-winning advisors should be subsidised for their work and/or get a bonus. All participants should be recognised for their efforts on the project. They could be given some rewards in order to encourage more teachers and students to involve themselves in innovative activities.

CONCLUSION

Innovation is a driving force behind a nation's prosperity. The Challenge Cup engineering project is a comprehensive platform by which to develop engineering students' innovative abilities. Therefore, the Challenge Cup engineering project is a great opportunity to carry out comprehensive innovative activities for enhancing engineering students' creative abilities, and overall quality, as well as for training more talent with innovative skills.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The study for this article was supported by the Teaching Reform Project of Liaoning University of Technology in 2012 (ID: 2012038) *Research on Training Mode and Practice of College Students' Innovation Ability Based on the Platform of the Challenge Cup Competition*, and the Teaching Reform Project of Liaoning University of Technology in 2014 (ID: 2014050).

REFERENCES

1. Wang, L., Wang, C.Y., Nian, D.J. and Jiang, H.F., Study on cultivation of innovation and practice ability for college students based on scientific and technological competition. *Advanced Materials Research*, 271-273, 1764-1767 (2011).

2. Ding, S-Q., Wang, X-P. and Chen, B., Technological innovation activities and innovation education in Chinese universities with special reference to the Challenge Cup. *Tsinghua J. of Educ.*, 30, **1**, 99-102 (2009).
3. Kustra, R., Shioda, R. and Zhu, M., A factor analysis model for functional genomics. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 7, 216-229 (2006).
4. Cheng, M., *Research on Internal Sectors for Prior Development of Tertiary Industry in Hefei*. Hefei: Hefei University of Technology Press, 23-25 (2010).
5. Vila, L.E., Higher education and the development of competencies for innovation in the workplace. *Manage. Decision*, 50, **9**, 1634-1648 (2012).
6. Bacon, C.M., The creation of an integrated sustainability curriculum and student praxis projects. *Inter. J. of Sustainability in Higher Educ.*, 12, **2**, 193-208 (2011).
7. Sessa, V.L., Adaptive, generative, and transformative learning in project teams. *Team Performance Manage.*, 17, **3/4**, 146-167(2011).
8. Hicks, D., Performance-based university research funding systems. *Research Policy*, 41, **2**, 251-261 (2012).