

Research on the Evaluation System of College Students' Numeracy: based on Analytic Hierarchy Process

Yanling Li, Shan Ding and Yunfeng Chen*

Normal School, Hubei Polytechnic University, Huangshi 435003, China

*Corresponding Author: 344592433@qq.com

Abstract

As an important part of the core quality of social members, improving the mathematical literacy of college students has become a fundamental task of contemporary education. In recent years, Numeracy has received widespread attention from all walks of life. How to improve students' numeracy has become a hot topic in educational research. In this paper, the mathematical modeling, visual imagination, mathematical abstraction, logical reasoning, data analysis and mathematical operation are taken as the primary indexes of mathematical literacy to abstract sixteen secondary indexes of numeracy by combining the advice of the experts and using questionnaires. Then the quantitative weights of two evaluation indexes of numeracy are given through the analytic hierarchy process and comprehensive evaluation and other methods, and some secondary evaluation indexes having been improved. Thus, a set of evaluation index system of college students' numeracy has been constructed.

Keywords

College students; Numeracy; Index system; Analytic hierarchy process.

1. Research Background

The thoughts and methods of modern mathematics have been integrated into many subjects such as society, economy, biology, information and so on. In order to cultivate students with good numeracy, this is also the basic requirements for contemporary college students.

The word "Numeracy" was first known to the public in 1959 when it was first popularly known in the Matteson's report of the United Kingdom[1]. After more than half a century of perfection and development, it has been agreed that "Numeracy" is based on the accumulation of common knowledge in mathematics itself, which can be explicitly reflected in the process of guiding mathematical activities in specific situations with holistic behavior characteristics and systematic scientific ideas[2]. According to "Mathematics Curriculum Standard of Full-time compulsory Education"[3] and "Mathematics Curriculum Standard of General Senior High School (Experimental draft)"[4], and combing and summing up the relevant literature, we find that the numeracy of college students should be embodied in six aspects: mathematical modeling, visual imagination, mathematical abstraction, logical reasoning, data analysis and mathematical operation. However, by combing and summarizing the relevant literature, it is found that most of the studies have defined the concept of Numeracy in six aspects from the qualitative point of view, and described its role, significance and cultivation in mathematics and life. But there is no secondary index of numeracy in six aspects, and there is a lack of the construction of Numeracy index system, and the quantitative study on it is carried out.

2. Research Methods

This paper attempts to elaborate the construction of the evaluation index system of college students' numeracy from the following three aspects: Firstly, through the interpretation of six aspects of numeracy, put forward reasonable secondary indicators; Secondly, through the in-depth interviews with teachers and managers, the secondary evaluation index is summed up to form a preliminary evaluation index system of numeracy. Thirdly, through the questionnaire survey of experts, the weight coefficient between the indexes is calculated by using the analytic hierarchy process. Fourthly, the reliability and validity of the evaluation index system are tested.

Due to the limitation of time and space, the interview is mainly conducted in Hubei Polytechnic University and Hubei normal University, and the subjects of the interview are the teaching and management staff with middle and senior professional titles and doctorate degrees in these two colleges and universities.

2.1. Index System

Based on the principles of scientificity, feasibility and completeness, the evaluation system of college students' mathematical literacy is set up through the reference of relevant literature and the arrangement and analysis of expert interview feedback. The specific steps are as follows:

2.2. Questionnaire Design

In the questionnaire, we ask experts to score the indexes according to the necessity of reflecting the numeracy of college students. The necessity given by us is divided into five grades, and the specific manifestations are: A score of 5 indicates that it is very necessary. A score of 4 indicates that it is necessary. A score of 3 indicates that it is general. A score of 2 indicates that it is unnecessary. A score of 1 is totally unnecessary. At the end of the evaluation, we also invited experts to propose their own amendments.

2.3. Measurement

In order to serve our screening and measurement of related indexes, we need to use the necessary means to measure the concentration trend of data based on the relevant knowledge and basic methods of statistics. The coefficient of variation is used to measure the discrete trend of the data. The mean value of necessity: This index reflects the concentration trend of data, which is the most common statistical measure in statistics. Its actual meaning is to look at the importance of a specific index in the whole selected index system from the point of view of average value. The larger the value is, the more important the corresponding index is, that is, the higher the average recognition of the index is. Coefficient of variation: it represents a ratio of the standard deviation of the obtained data to the average of the obtained data[5]. The value of the index is generally in the range of 0.05-0.35. If the value is less than 0.15, it means that the dispersion of the obtained data is low, which is acceptable. The smaller the value of the index, the higher the degree of coordination among the opinions given by the experts, and the more consistent the experts' attitude towards the importance of the evaluation index is.

3. Results

3.1. The Second-level Index Consultation Result Analysis

According to our choice of necessity mean and coefficient of variation, through the Table 1 shows, the necessity of problem solving, mathematical expression and innovation consciousness is a little high, and the variation coefficient is low, it shows that the three indicators should be mathematical abstraction of secondary indexes. But the necessity of the

index of mathematics humanities mean obviously lower than other index, at the same level and the variation coefficient is 0.1622, higher than 0.15, suggesting that should not be set for mathematical modeling of mathematics humanities index at a lower level. Therefore, the problem solving, mathematical expression and innovation consciousness are the second-level index under the mathematical modeling.

Table 1. Second-level index consultation results under mathematical modeling

| Second-level index | Necessity mean | Standard deviation | Coefficient of variation |
|--------------------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Solution problem | 4.92 | 0.39 | 0.0793 |
| Mathematical expression | 4.78 | 0.51 | 0.1067 |
| Mathematical humanities | 4.13 | 0.67 | 0.1622 |
| Innovative consciousness | 4.85 | 0.43 | 0.0887 |

Also, through the analysis of Table 2 shows that should not mathematics comprehension as intuitive imagination indicators at a lower level, therefore, intuitive, space concept, and we will figure combination as intuitive imagination sets of second-level index.

Table 2. Second-level index consultation results under intuitive imagination

| Second-level index | Necessity mean | Standard deviation | Coefficient of variation |
|---------------------------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Intuitive figures | 4.58 | 0.63 | 0.1376 |
| Space concept | 4.66 | 0.54 | 0.1159 |
| Combination of number and shape | 4.80 | 0.49 | 0.1021 |
| Mathematics comprehension | 4.45 | 0.87 | 0.1955 |

Table 3. Second-level index consultation results under mathematical abstractions

| Second-level index | Necessity mean | Standard deviation | Coefficient of variation |
|------------------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Mathematical induction | 3.40 | 0.55 | 0.1618 |
| Mathematical knowledge | 4.57 | 0.48 | 0.1050 |
| Mathematical summary | 4.83 | 0.35 | 0.0725 |
| Symbol consciousness | 4.84 | 0.26 | 0.0537 |

Also, through the analysis of Table 3, the experts don't approve of setting mathematical induction as mathematical abstraction indicators at a lower level, therefore, we would use mathematical knowledge, mathematics generalization and symbolic consciousness as a mathematical abstraction sets of second-level index.

Similarly, it can be seen from Table 4 that judgment inference should not be set as a subordinate indicator of logical reasoning. Therefore, logical reasoning, deductive reasoning and inductive generalization are used as second-level index of logical reasoning.

Table 4. Second-level index consultation results under logical deduction

| Second-level index | Necessity mean | Standard deviation | Coefficient of variation |
|---------------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Plausible reasoning | 4.74 | 0.62 | 0.1308 |
| Judgment reasoning | 4.45 | 0.72 | 0.1618 |
| Deductive reasoning | 4.85 | 0.23 | 0.0474 |
| Summarizing | 4.65 | 0.59 | 0.1269 |

Similarly, it can be seen from Table 5 that experts are opposed to setting multi-dimensional thinking as a subordinate index for data analysis. Therefore, we will analyze data and application data as second-level index for data analysis.

Table 5. Second-level index consultation results under data analysis

| Second-level index | Necessity mean | Standard deviation | Coefficient of variation |
|---------------------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Analytical data | 4.65 | 0.61 | 0.1312 |
| Application data | 4.95 | 0.67 | 0.1354 |
| Multidimensional thinking | 4.40 | 0.75 | 0.1705 |

Similarly, through the analysis of table 6, it is known that the numerical calculation should not be set as the subordinate index of mathematical operation, therefore, the number sense and algebraic operation are the secondary indexes of mathematical operation.

Table 6. Second-level index consultation results under mathematical operation

| Second-level index | Necessity mean | Standard deviation | Coefficient of variation |
|---------------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Number sense | 4.79 | 0.26 | 0.0543 |
| Numeric Calculation | 4.26 | 0.67 | 0.1573 |

| | | | |
|---------------------|------|------|--------|
| algebraic operation | 4.86 | 0.43 | 0.0885 |
|---------------------|------|------|--------|

According to the above analysis, the mathematical literacy evaluation index system of college students is obtained, which consists of six primary indexes and 16 secondary indicators, as shown in Table 7.

Table 7. College students' mathematical literacy education evaluation index system

| First-class index | Second-level index | First-class index | Second-level index |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Mathematical modeling | Problem solution | Intuitive imagination | Intuitive figures |
| | Innovative consciousness | | Space concept |
| | Mathematical expression | | Combination of number and shape |
| Mathematical abstractions | Mathematical knowledge | Logical deduction | Plausible reasoning |
| | Mathematical | | Deductive reasoning |
| | Symbol consciousness | | Summarizing |
| Data analysis | Analytical data | Mathematical operation | Number sense |
| | Application data | | Algebraic operation |

3.2. Index Weight

3.2.1. Calculation of the Weight Coefficient of the First-level Evaluation Index

Analytic hierarchy process is a multi-criteria decision method pioneered by professor Saaty ,the university of Pittsburgh in the mid-1970s [6-9]. We use this to evaluate the mathematical accomplishment, and the detailed calculation steps are as follows [6] :

Based on the 1-9 scale determination method, the following first-level evaluation index judgment matrix is constructed, as shown in Table 8.

Table 8. Judgment matrix of primary evaluation index

| First-class indexes | Mathematical modeling | Intuitive imagination | Mathematical abstractions | Logical deduction | Data analysis | Mathematical operation |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Mathematical modeling | 1 | 1/4 | 1/5 | 1/3 | 1 | 1/3 |
| Intuitive imagination | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Mathematical abstractions | 5 | 1/2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Logical deduction | 3 | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | 1/3 |
| Data analysis | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 2 | 1 | 1/2 |
| Mathematical operation | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

The relative weights of the two comparisons can also be represented by the matrix.

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{5} & \frac{1}{3} & 1 & \frac{1}{3} \\ 4 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 1 \\ 5 & \frac{1}{2} & 1 & 2 & 2 & 1 \\ 3 & 1 & \frac{1}{2} & 1 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{3} \\ 1 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & 2 & 1 & \frac{1}{2} \\ 3 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Based on the above comparison judgment matrix, the corresponding eigenvector and the maximum characteristic root are calculated.

$$\bar{w}_1 = \left(\prod_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} = [0.421 \quad 1.587 \quad 1.468 \quad 0.794 \quad 0.794 \quad 1.619]^r$$

Again to \bar{w}_1 normalized processing:

$$w_i = \frac{\bar{w}_i}{\sum_{j=1}^n \bar{w}_j} = \left[\frac{0.421}{6.683} \quad \frac{1.587}{6.683} \quad \frac{1.468}{6.683} \quad \frac{0.794}{6.683} \quad \frac{0.794}{6.683} \quad \frac{1.619}{6.683} \right]^r$$

$$= [0.063 \quad 0.237 \quad 0.220 \quad 0.119 \quad 0.119 \quad 0.242]^r$$

Thus, the following eigenvectors can be obtained:

$$W = [0.063 \quad 0.237 \quad 0.220 \quad 0.119 \quad 0.119 \quad 0.242]^T$$

The corresponding maximum characteristic root is.

$$\lambda_{\max} = 6.397$$

Calculate the consistency index.

$$CI = \frac{\lambda_{\max} - 1}{n - 1} = \frac{6.397 - 6}{6 - 1} = 0.079$$

Take RI =1.26 according to the random consistency index. The consistency ratio can be calculated as follows:

$$CR = \frac{CI}{RI} = \frac{0.079}{1.26} = 0.063$$

Since the consistency ratio is less than 0.1, the weight coefficient can be used for decision analysis. Therefore, the weight coefficient of the expert evaluation index is shown in Table 9.

Table 9. The weight coefficient of first-class indexes

| First-class indexes | Weight coefficient | First-class indexes | Weight coefficient |
|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| Mathematical modeling | 0.063 | Intuitive imagination | 0.237 |
| Mathematical abstractions | 0.220 | Logical deduction | 0.119 |
| Data analysis | 0.119 | Mathematical operation | 0.242 |

3.2.2. The Calculation of the Weight Coefficient of the Secondary Index

For the calculation of the weight coefficient of the secondary index, the method of hierarchical analysis is still adopted, so only two are listed. The weight coefficients of the grade indicators are shown in table 10-15.

Table 10. The second-class indexes weight coefficient under mathematical modeling

| Mathematical modeling | Solution problem | Innovative consciousness | Mathematical expression | Weight coefficient |
|--------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|
| Solution problem | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0.500 |
| Innovative consciousness | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | 0.250 |
| Mathematical expression | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | 0.250 |
| CI =0 RI =0.52 CR =0 | | | | |

Table 11. The second-class indexes weight coefficient under intuitive imagination

| | Combination of number and shape | Space concept | Intuitive figures | Weight coefficient |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Combination of number and shape | 1 | 1/4 | 1 | 0.167 |
| Space concept | 4 | 1 | 4 | 0.666 |
| Intuitive figures | 1 | 1/4 | 1 | 0.167 |
| CI =0 RI =0.52 CR =0 | | | | |

Table 12. The second-class indexes weight coefficient under mathematical abstractions

| Mathematical abstractions | Symbol consciousness | Mathematical summary | Mathematical knowledge | Weight coefficient |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| Symbol consciousness | 1 | 1/3 | 2 | 0.238 |
| Mathematical summary | 3 | 1 | 4 | 0.625 |
| Mathematical knowledge | 1/2 | 1/4 | 1 | 0.137 |
| CI =0.0093 RI =0.52 CR =0.0179 | | | | |

Table 13. The second-class indexes weight coefficient under logical deduction

| Logical deduction | Summarizing | Deductive reasoning | Plausible reasoning | Weight coefficient |
|--------------------------------|-------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Summarizing | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0.558 |
| Deductive reasoning | 1/2 | 1 | 1/3 | 0.122 |
| Plausible reasoning | 1/2 | 3 | 1 | 0.320 |
| CI =0.0092 RI =0.52 CR =0.0177 | | | | |

Table 14. The second-class indexes weight coefficient under data analysis

| Data analysis | Application data | Analytical data | Weight coefficient |
|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Application data | 1 | 1 | 0.500 |
| Analytical data | 1 | 1 | 0.500 |
| CI =0 RI =0 CR =0 | | | |

Table 15. The second-class indexes weight coefficient under mathematical operation

| Mathematical operation | Number sense | Algebraic operation | Weight coefficient |
|------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Number sense | 1 | 2 | 0.667 |
| Algebraic operation | 1/2 | 1 | 0.333 |
| CI =0 RI =0 CR =0 | | | |

3.2.3. The Calculation of the Combined Weight Coefficient

By using the principle of probability multiplication, the weight coefficient of indexes at all levels is in the order of the subordinate to the superior. In order to multiply, the weight coefficient can be combined. The specific weight coefficients are shown in Table 16.

4. Evaluation Index System Verification

4.1. Reliability Analysis

This passage adopted Cronbach reliability coefficient.

$$\alpha = \frac{n}{n - 1} \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n S_i^2}{S_x^2} \right)$$

Among them, n represents the number of questionnaire design subjects, S_i^2 represents scores of variance on a certain topic, S_x^2 represents total variance in scores on the questionnaire. Using SPSS to calculate the reliability is 0.912, indicating that the reliability of the research findings is desirable. Therefore, the evaluation index system of college students' mathematics accomplishment is reliable.

Table 16. The weight coefficient of mathematical literacy evaluation index system of college students

| Decision objective | First-class indexes | Second-level index | Synthetic weight |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------|
| Evaluation index system of mathematics literacy of college students. (1.000) | B1 Mathematical modeling (0.063) | C1 Problem solution(0.500) | 0.0330 |
| | | C2 Innovative consciousness(0.250) | 0.0150 |
| | | C3 Mathematical expression(0.250) | 0.0150 |
| | B2 Intuitive imagination(0.237) | C4 Combination of number and shape(0.167) | 0.0400 |
| | | C5 Space concept(0.666) | 0.1570 |
| | | C6 Intuitive figures(0.167) | 0.0400 |
| | B3 Mathematical abstractions (0.220) | C7 Symbol consciousness(0.238) | 0.0520 |
| | | C8 Mathematical summary(0.625) | 0.1380 |
| | | C9 Mathematical knowledge(0.137) | 0.0300 |
| | B4 Logical deduction (0.119) | C10 Summarizing(0.558) | 0.0660 |
| | | C11 Deductive reasoning (0.122) | 0.0140 |
| | | C12 Plausible reasoning(0.320) | 0.0390 |
| | B5 Data analysis (0.119) | C13 Application data(0.500) | 0.0595 |
| | | C14 Analytical data(0.500) | 0.0595 |
| | B6 Mathematical operation (0.242) | C15 Number sense(0.667) | 0.1610 |
| | | C16 Algebraic operation(0.333) | 0.0810 |

4.2. Validity Analysis

Validity usually consists of two aspects: surface validity and content validity, which reflects the degree of objective authenticity of objects.

Surface validity refers to the research results obtained in accordance with the general opinions and understandings of the experts or the public on the issue or things. Single and combined the related analysis, this article USES calculated by SPSS software, and the scores of each item total correlation coefficient $r=0.874$, so under the 95% significant level, determine the research results of face validity is good.

Content validity refers to the degree of approval of the experts to the target object of the research, measurement or evaluation. This article mainly uses the factor analytic method to analysis the content validity of the questionnaire, through the SPSS software options, analysis, dimension reduction, factor analysis, all the subjective topic choice: "project", click on the description, choose KMO test, click to rotate, choose the maximum variance method, click options, and sorted by size. Get $KMO = 0.893$. Therefore, the evaluation index system constructed in this study has good content validity.

Acknowledgements

This paper was sponsored by Hubei Polytechnic University's Scientific Research Key Project, Research on the Evaluation System of College students' Numeracy: based on the SEM mode (17xjz01A);

Hubei colleges and universities 2019 provincial college students innovation and entrepreneurship training program project "Post production of pictures based on Internet" (S201910920052X).

References

- [1] Matteson S, Mathematical literacy and Mathematical sophistication, Reading Psychology, 2006 No.27, p. 205-233.
- [2] Hongyu Su: Research on the connotation and evaluation of students' geometric literacy (MS., East China Normal University, China 2009).
- [3] The ministry of education of the People's Republic of China: Compulsory education mathematics curriculum standard (2011 edition) (Beijing Normal University Press, China 2012).
- [4] The ministry of education of the People's Republic of China: Normal high school mathematics curriculum standard (experiment) (People Education Press, China 2003).
- [5] Dehuai Gui: Study on the middle school students' connotation and evaluation of algebra (MS., East China Normal University, China 2011).
- [6] Shubai Xu: Principle of analytic hierarchy process (Tianjin University Press, China 1986).
- [7] Mingwei Xiao: Study based on hierarchical analysis on comprehensive quality evaluation of junior middle school students (MS., Liaoning Normal University, China 2009).
- [8] Yue Wang, Qi Wang, The application of analytic hierarchy process in the employment of education in graduates, Continuing education, 2014 No.1, p.60-61.
- [9] Minhui Liu, The application of analytic hierarchy process in comprehensive quality assessment of high school students, Education theoretical research, 2015 No.5, p.5-9.