Improved students’ performance prediction for multi-class imbalanced problems using hybrid and ensemble approach in educational data mining
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Abstract. Among the problems raised in the data mining area, the class imbalance is a well-known issue that always occurs. Many researchers studied this issue in several fields using three commonly used techniques: sampling, ensemble, or cost-sensitive learning. However, such studies are still new in education domains. This problem always related to the quality of data that gives the most impact to form an accurate prediction result. Many previous studies focus on binary imbalance classification problems instead of the multi-class imbalance problem in education data. This study used 4413 student instances of two datasets; students’ information system and e-learning from the Faculty of Engineering in a Malaysia university for First Semester 2017/2018. Three sampling categories utilized in this study are oversampling techniques, undersampling techniques, and hybrid techniques. The research empirically analyzes five types of ensemble classifiers and seven sampling techniques. The experimental results show a hybrid technique ROS with AdaBoost produces the most excellent performance compared to the other benchmark techniques. SMOTEENN technique with ensembles classifiers consistently produces high results. This technique has great potential in improving the students’ performance prediction model.

1. Introduction

Due to education data increased significantly, prediction model development with high accuracy is so important to evaluate and improve students’ accomplishment. The academic data is the best predictor in data mining. Besides that, studies by many researchers have proven that demographics and behaviours of students’ factors using ensemble learning contributes to building good students’ performance prediction model [1-5].

Data preprocessing is the most necessary action to form students’ performance prediction models in higher education. The massive number of data might cause data to suffer from noise and other problems like class imbalance. Hence, features selection and noise filtering are essential steps to ensure data is ready for modeling. When trained a machine learning model using imbalanced data, the model will be more towards the majority classes compared to minority class[6]. Consequently, the model will be biased to the majority class.

Class imbalance is one of the ten problems raised in the field of data mining [7]. Many techniques developed to solve the class imbalance problems. However, most of them are to handle binary class imbalance and only a few studies on multi-class imbalance issues for education. Hence, the multi-class imbalance problems need more research for performance prediction model improvement [8].
Multi-class imbalance used class decomposition to convert multi-class to binary. One-versus-all or also known as one-versus-rest (OVA or OVR) and one-versus-one (OVO) types of class decomposition always being used in the literature review [11].

This work compared five ensemble models and have applied sampling techniques to multi-class imbalanced data. The best features based on ranking selected before balanced the data using sampling techniques and learning the data using machine learning classifiers. This paper aims to identify the solution of noise problem and imbalanced in multi-class data to improve students’ performance prediction model by evaluating the most suitable imbalanced data classification technique and machine learning algorithm to identify at-risk students.

This study guided by a few research questions: 1. What are the students’ data features that might influence the students’ performance? 2. What are the suitable ensemble classifiers and imbalanced data classification techniques to improve students’ performance prediction models? 3. Do fine-tuning hyperparameters help in improving ensemble classifier performance after applying the imbalance technique?

This paper presents the sequential of sections as follows: Section 2 described the methodology and tools used for the study. This including data collection, integration, preprocessing and modeling. Conversely, this section explains about the classifiers and type of sampling methods. Section 3 shows and discusses the empirical experiment results by using ensemble algorithms and sampling methods. Finally, section 4 concludes the overall study and suggestions for future work.

2. Methodology
This section defined the research problem and described the implementation of the model in detail.

2.1. Datasets Collection
This study combines two real data from the students’ information system (SIS) and e-learning (EL) logfile. The data collected from a public research university in Malaysia in the first session of 2017/2018. This study used 4413 numbers of undergraduate students' data from the Faculty of Engineering [9].

2.2. Tools and instruments
This study used Python and Jupyter Notebook to execute the experiment. Scikitlearn python package used for the machine learning algorithm and Imblearn python package used to resample the imbalance class.

2.3. Preprocessing
Preprocessing is an essential step in data mining to increase data quality and assure the modeling process be more efficient [10]. By using Scikitlearn preprocessing package in python, sequences of preprocessing steps done. First, preliminary features filtering executed where the unrequired data removed from the list. Next, the transformation process performed where the categorical data converted to numerical values to ensure they are suitable for modeling. Finally, the normalization process executed to convert all figures to the small range and ready for the modeling process.

2.4. Feature Selection
Features selection reduces data dimensional to improve the result of data mining. This study used feature selection with the filter method that supports by statistical evidence. Steps are including sorting and filtering the features. Finally, the top-ranking features will be selected [8].

There are 19 features selected from the first stage filtering. The features classified into three groups: academic background, demographical with socioeconomic and behavior e-learning. 13 top features out of 19 features used as the predictors (bold features) as shown Table 1.
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Table 1. Features Categories and Description [8]

| Category                  | Feature                          | Description               |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Academic Background       | Study_Method                     | Coursework or research    |
| Features                  | Programme                        | Programme of study        |
| Demographics/Socioeconomic| Family_Income                   | Family income range       |
| Features                  | Student_Status                   | Student status            |
| Behaviour Features (E-Learning) | User_Logedin                  | Count no of login         |
|                           | Course_Viewed                    | Count course viewed       |
|                           | Course_Module_Viewed             | Count resources viewed    |
|                           | Discussion_Viewed                | Count forum/discussion viewed |
|                           | Submission_Form_Submitted        | Count course submitted    |
|                           | Attempt_Viewed                   | Count assignment viewed   |
|                           | Assesable_Submitted              | Count assignment submitted|

The students' CGPA feature chose as the experiment output or label. This study transformed the CGPA numerical list to 3 classes of categorical formed: low, moderate and excellent according to university standard grading [9]. ClassLabel used as the column name for the label.

2.5. Resampling Technique
Resampling is the method that develops techniques to solve the imbalanced data problem by balancing the imbalanced classes. There are three categories of sampling methods[7]:

- Oversampling Techniques-This technique will be duplicated or generate new minority class instances [9]. It usually used for the small and average size of data. The examples of this technique are Synthetic Minority Oversampling Technique (SMOTE), Random Oversampling (ROS) and Adaptive Synthetic Sampling (ADASYN). In 2002, a reported work of [10] proposed an oversampling technique named SMOTE that able to create a minority synthetic class. It became more popular and the most frequently used in imbalanced classification problems. [16]. However, steps to duplicate or creating new instances in oversampling techniques can cause overfitting [6].

- Undersampling Techniques-This technique will remove data instances from the majority class [9]. Random Undersampling (RUS), Edited Nearest Neighbors (ENN) and Tomek Links (TL) are a few examples of the undersampling techniques. The technique is suitable for vast data. Despite its strength, this technique has a weakness where data reduction will cause information loss.

- Hybrid Techniques-This technique combined oversampling with undersampling or oversampling or undersampling with ensemble techniques. Some examples of this technique are SMOTE-ENN, SMOTE-TL, SMOTEBest and RUSBoost.

2.6. Classification using Machine Learning Classifiers
This study is using five different techniques of ensemble learning. By default, all ensemble learning classifiers are using the Decision Tree method as a base algorithm. The brief description is as follows:
• Decision Tree (DT) is a partitioning based modelling algorithm that is commonly used [11], [12]. It splits data points into two groups to gain possible answers to the questions.
• Random Forest (RF) ensemble classifier contains many decision trees model and fall to a type of bagging ensemble. Increase number of Decision Tree contributes to the robust Random Forest model. It usually used to perform regression and classification tasks. Its algorithm produces a class that is the mode of overall individual decision trees. Random forest might overfit with a small dataset [3].
• Bootstrapping Aggregating or Bagging is an ensemble classifier that increases the accuracy of weak classifiers. It trained leaners in parallel and learns them differently. It consolidates each learned classifier result using an averaging process [2].
• Boosting is one of the ensemble techniques that manages to convert classifiers that weak to become stronger. It selects wrong predictions data points produced by the previous learner and adjusts their weight. It also can reduce bias and variance in supervised learning.
• AdaBoost is a boosting type algorithm that eliminated the limitation of Boosting. It focused more on the part or pattern that is difficult to classify. Weights are assigned equally to all subsets. It will increase the misclassified instance weight but decrease the truly classified instance weight. Finally, the voting process used to incorporate groups of weak learners to become stronger learners [2].
• Gradient boosting is a type of algorithm to find approximate solutions to the additive modelling problem. Like AdaBoost, Gradient boosting builds weak learners a sequentially. Gradient boosting generates learners during the learning process.
• The extreme Gradient Boosting (XGBoost) technique is a powerful ensemble learning technique. It used the Gradient Boosting designed framework to increase speed and performance.

2.7. Performance Measure
This study used four classification performance metrics to evaluate the performance of machine learning models. The formula is as follows:

\[ \text{Accuracy} = \frac{TP}{TP + TN + FP + FN} \]  \hspace{1cm} (1)

\[ \text{Precision} = \frac{TP}{TP + FP} \]  \hspace{1cm} (2)

\[ \text{Recall} = \frac{TP}{TP + FN} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3)

\[ F\text{measure} = 2 \times \frac{\text{Precision} \times \text{Recall}}{\text{Precision} + \text{Recall}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (4)

The confusion matrix used to explain the classification model. It classifies instances to four label features: True Positive group, True Negative group, False Positive group, and False Negative group. For the positive group, data will be True Positive when real positive data predicted to be positive. Data will be True Negative when data predicted to be negative. In false groups, data will be False Positive (FP) when it is negative but predicted as positive. Data classified as False Negative (FN) when it is positive but predicted as negative [13].

2.8. Modelling
The data divided into two categories, train and test with ratio 70:30. Then, the 10 folds cross-validation technique applied to every classification model. Grid search used to find the best hyperparameters for every model to get the optimum result.
3. Result and Discussion

3.1. Experiment 1

Table 2 shows the first experiment executed. This experiment used three categories of data: student information system (SIS), e-learning (EL) and a combination of the student information system (SIS) and e-learning (EL). Five ensemble learning models trained: Random Forest (RF), Bagging (BGG), AdaBoost (AB), Gradient boosting (GB) and XGBoost (XGB) to evaluate the performance.

| Algorithm         | Features | Accuracy | Precision | Recall  | F-measure |
|-------------------|----------|----------|-----------|---------|-----------|
| Random Forest     | SIS      | 0.695    | 0.489     | 0.404   | 0.409     |
|                   | EL       | 0.631    | 0.415     | 0.366   | 0.378     |
|                   | SIS + EL | 0.653    | 0.517     | 0.399   | 0.418     |
|                   | SIS      | 0.692    | 0.445     | 0.413   | 0.413     |
| Bagging           | EL       | 0.629    | 0.385     | 0.375   | 0.362     |
|                   | SIS + EL | 0.657    | 0.481     | 0.425   | **0.425** |
|                   | SIS      | 0.690    | 0.482     | 0.407   | 0.416     |
| AdaBoost          | EL       | 0.643    | 0.393     | 0.369   | 0.365     |
|                   | SIS + EL | 0.654    | 0.524     | 0.403   | 0.395     |
|                   | SIS      | 0.718    | 0.433     | 0.404   | 0.400     |
| Gradient boosting | EL       | 0.689    | 0.399     | 0.360   | 0.330     |
|                   | SIS + EL | 0.706    | 0.506     | 0.408   | 0.407     |
|                   | SIS      | 0.723    | 0.442     | 0.408   | 0.405     |
| XGBoost           | EL       | 0.695    | 0.417     | 0.360   | 0.328     |
|                   | SIS + EL | 0.707    | 0.510     | 0.402   | 0.398     |

The experiment result shows a training model using the XGBoost classifier and SIS data produce the highest accuracy. However, accuracy is not suitable when the classes are imbalance since it does not distinguish correct classified data into multi-class. This study focuses on F-Measure that is mean of precision and recall. Based on experiment results, the highest F-measure gained when trained model using Bagging Classifier and a combination of the SIS and EL data.

According to [2], students’ behaviour features contribute to the improvement of accuracy in the model proposed. They discovered a strong relationship between academic and behaviour features. Moreover, [14] and [15] also discovered by having behaviour features, performance accuracy in students’ performance prediction models will be improved. A finding by [16] proves the robust relationship between students’ behaviour and academic performance. They discovered that by using behaviour features using hybrid classification and clustering technique, prediction result improved. Research by [2], [3], [11], [17]–[22] discovered the ensemble techniques improve students’ prediction model. They prove the ensemble technique manages to increase the students’ performance prediction model.

3.2. Experiment 2

The second experiment employed sampling methods to overcome the multi-class imbalance problems. Table 3 shows the results of the empirical study using the F-Measure performance metric after applying the sampling techniques in three categories for imbalanced data. The experiment trained models using five ensemble classifiers and a combination of SIS and EL datasets.

Among the classifier trained, all show improvement after balancing the multi-class labels. The highest accuracy result gained after applied AdaBoost ensemble classifiers and ROS. However,
SMOTEENN frequently obtains the highest results among all imbalance techniques employed. These show that SMOTEENN is the most suitable hybrid technique to the education data used in this study.

Table 3. Applied Imbalance Techniques

| Type       | Technique | RF   | BGG   | AB    | GB    | XGB    |
|------------|-----------|------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| Oversampling | SMOTE     | 0.750 | 0.753 | 0.757 | 0.582 | 0.547  |
|            | ROS       | **0.870** | 0.862 | **0.916** | 0.662 | 0.628  |
|            | ADASYN    | 0.716 | 0.714 | 0.773 | 0.630 | 0.649  |
| Undersampling | RUS       | 0.548 | 0.529 | 0.508 | 0.536 | 0.547  |
|            | NearMiss  | 0.792 | 0.781 | 0.768 | 0.771 | 0.709  |
| Hybrid     | SMOTEENN  | 0.865 | **0.872** | 0.839 | **0.801** | **0.773** |
|            | SMOTETL   | 0.765 | 0.769 | 0.820 | 0.667 | 0.650  |

A study by [6] proved that four classifiers: Logistic Regression, Support Vector Machine, Random Forest and AdaBoost show better performance using two noise filter methods with the class imbalance approach: BST-CF and BST-EF. Research done by [23] proposed the hybrid technique, Bagged NBDT, which are hybrid of bagging and weak classifiers, Naive Bayes and Decision Tree for the multi-class problem that executed on 52 datasets. Experiment results prove the technique outperforms a few ensemble methods used. In another study by [24] proved that a new multi-class imbalance classification algorithm named Diversified Error-Correcting Output Codes (DECOC) produced significant improvement when train using Regression, C4.5, AdaBoost, Random Forests, CART and Multilayer perceptron compare to 17 other benchmark classifiers. A different study by [25] proposed two novel methods, bagging with ADASYN sampling technique and bagging with hybrid technique RSYN. Results show the proposed methods give good results compared with the existing best performing method on 11 imbalanced datasets.

4. Conclusion and Future works

Student achievement and performance are essential criteria that have been monitor frequently by education sectors, particularly by the management of institutions. The institutions are generally taking into account and consistently emphasising the importance of identifying students’ performance. Educational Data Mining used many machine learning techniques to identify students’ performance. This study examined different ensemble prediction methods to identify method can produce better students’ performance prediction result. The experiment executed shows the combination of 13 features as predictors trained using ensemble methods. The experiment result shows the sampling techniques and ensembles classifiers improve the students’ performance prediction model. By implement data preprocessing, cross-validation technique with the 10-folds and the algorithms fine-tuning using the grid search method improved the effectiveness of the performance prediction model.

The experiment shows that the highest result gain when training the model using AdaBoost Ensemble Classifier and balanced class using Random Oversampling (ROS). However, SMOTEENN frequently performs well among all sampling techniques used. Results obtained from the model of students’ predictions could potentially help educational institutions and educators to monitor students’ achievement and identify at-risk students from the earlier stage. The hybrid approach has been proven effective throughout the experiments. It has great potential in facilitating higher education institutions to execute many more accurate prediction models and reduced the at-risk prediction.

In future research, the limitation of this paper will be improved by develops more combinations of hybrid techniques to solve the multi-class classification problem. Then, experiments need to use cross-domain data to have a broad overview of the benchmark. Subsequently, future study might also focus more on the hybrid of ensemble techniques with different base-classifiers, with more hyper-tuning parameters.
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