Prediction of Student's Academic Performance Based on Adaptive Neuro-Fuzzy Inference

Altyeb Altaher and Omar BaRukab

Department of Information Technology, Faculty of Computing and Information Technology-Rabigh King Abdulaziz University, P.O. Box 344

Rabigh, 21911, Saudi Arabia

Summary

Prediction of student's performance is potentially important for educational institutions to assist the students in improving their academic performance, and deliver high quality education. Developing an accurate student's performance prediction model is challenging task. This paper employs the Adaptive Neuro-Fuzzy Inference system (ANFIS) for student academic performance prediction to help students improve their academic achievements. The proposed approach consists of two steps. First, results of the students in the previous exams are preprocessed by normalizing their results in order of improving the accuracy and efficiency of the prediction. Second, The ANFIS is applied to predict the students' expected performance in the next semester. Three ANFIS models viz. ANFIS-GaussMF, ANFIS-TriMF and ANFIS-GbellMF that utilized various membership functions to generate accurate fuzzy rules for the prediction process of the student's performance are used in this research work. The experimental results showed that ANFIS-GbellMF model surpassed the other ANFIS models with a Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) as low as 0.193.

Key words:

Adaptive Neural Fuzzy Inference System; Student's performance prediction; educational data mining.

1. Introduction

Student performance prediction is an important factor to deliver high quality education. Educational Institutes are endeavoring to incorporate student Performance prediction into their educational processes for better students' support, by arranging additional efforts for the students with lower performance. Data mining methods are used extensively in many organizations as a promising way for exploring the enormous amounts of data, finding beneficial information to help in making potential decisions. Data mining methods can be applied in educational institutes to advance the students' performance and the quality of education. Educational data mining which has been used widely in educational area, concern with finding methods for exploring the continuously increasing amount of data in the educational domain to extract significant information and new knowledge to

guide the students' learning and improve the process of learning [1,2,3].

The continuously increasing amount of educational databases, contain potential hidden information that are yet to be discovered to improve students' academic performance. Education data mining explores massive educational databases to extract the hidden significant information for further processing. The smeared information will support many educational processes such as students' performance prediction [6], which enable the educators to explore potential knowledge about students. The classification, clustering, visualization and regression, are various techniques that have been used for extracting the hidden information in educational databases.

Classification has been considered frequently as an important technique in educational data mining. Classification is a method that assigns data values to different predefined Classes, it aims to predict the correct class for each data element. There are several approaches for data classification including artificial neural network, Bayesian classifiers and support vector machine techniques [9]. These approaches have been used widely in educational systems [10-12]. The Neuro- fuzzy inference system (NFIS) is a soft computing tool which combines the fuzzy logic reasoning with the neural network capability of learning, thus the neuro fuzzy inference system handle the disadvantages of both neural networks and fuzzy systems when they are used separately [13]. NFIS has been adapted successfully in applications such as control and classification [14,15].

In this paper, ANFIS is used for students' academic performance prediction in order to help students to improve their achievements. The proposed ANFIS based approach intelligently integrates the capability reasoning of the fuzzy logic with the learning abilities of the neural networks. The main contributions of this paper is the utilization of ANFIS for accurate student performance prediction.

Section 2 presents the literature review while the proposed approach is explained in sections 3. Results and discussion are shown in section 4. Conclusion is presented in section 5.

Manuscript received January 5, 2017 Manuscript revised January 20, 2017

2. Literature Review

The rapid advances in education technologies assist the educational institutes to practice the student performance prediction models [4,5]. Several techniques were used to predict students' performance. In [7], Barber and Sharkey used the logistic regression method for students' performance for prediction based on the data collected from the available students' information, financial information and learning management systems. Wolff et al. in [8], applied a decision-tree technique to detect the students with at risk academic situation. Jai Ruby & David in [16] used different data mining techniques for students' performance prediction. They found that the neural network technique outperforms the other data mining techniques and achieved heights student performance prediction of 74.8%

In [17], Abu Naser et al., used the Artificial Neural Network (ANN) model for the prediction of the performance of Engineering faculty students, they considered the students scores in the courses, number of passed credits and the cumulative grade point average as factors to evaluate the student performance, the ANN model correctly predict the student performance with accuracy of 80%

Ajith et al. in [18], proposed a rule mining framework for the evaluation of the performance of the students based on the Association Rules. Association Rules utilized to explore the student dataset for obtaining significant information for the student performance evaluation.

3. The Proposed Approach For Student Performance Prediction

The proposed approach mainly consists of two parts. In the first part, the results of the students in the previous exams are preprocessed by normalizing the student results to enhance the accuracy and the efficiency of the prediction. In the second part, the proposed approach is based on ANFIS is applied to predict the students' expected performances in the next semester. Fig. 1 shows the proposed approach for student performance prediction.



Fig. 1 The proposed approach for students' performance prediction.

3.1 Data preprocessing

The used dataset consists of 100 samples for computer science students, there are 5 compulsory subjects in the dataset, scores gained by students in these compulsory subjects are in the range from 0-100. The first step of the proposed approach is the preprocessing of the dataset. This step is potentially important to decrease error during the learning process, and to obtain more clear inputs for data mining approaches [19].

The normalization is accomplished by computing the mean and standard deviation of the data samples. Equation 1 provides the normalized sample X_i using the sample mean μ , and the standard deviation σ of the data sample.

$$X_i = \frac{x_i - \mu}{\sigma} \tag{1}$$

3.2 The Adaptive Neuro Fuzzy Inference System

ANFIS gathers the advantages of fuzzy logic and neural network [20]. It has been successfully used in classification and prediction tasks. A simple architecture for ANFIS consists of two inputs (x and y), two fuzzy rules and single output (k), the Takagi and Surgeons' fuzzy rules used in ANFIS can be expressed as follows:

$$R_{1} = IF \ x \ is \ M_{1} \ and \ y \ is \ N_{1}, then \ k_{1} = c_{1}x + d_{1}y + z_{1} \ (2)$$

$$R_{2} = IF \ x \ is \ M_{2} \ and \ y \ is \ N_{2}, then \ k_{2} = c_{2}x + d_{2}y + z_{2} \ (3)$$

 $x_{and} y$ denote the inputs to the ANFIS system, M_i and , N_i represent the fuzzy sets, k_i represent the outputs of the fuzzy rule, while c_i, d_i and z_i represent the parameters

specified through the training process. Fig. 2 shows the ANFIS which consists of 5 layers, each layer performs certain function.

A membership function is represented by a curve that shows exactly how the points in the input data are accurately be mapped to a membership degree in a range between the two values 0 and 1 [21]. In this paper, three varieties of membership functions that are utilized to define the fuzzy inference syste parameters, viz. Gaussian MF (gaussmf), triangular MF (trimf) and Generalized Bell MF (gbellmf). The three membership functions are defined as follows: **gbellmf(x, a, b, c) =** $\frac{1}{1 + \left|\frac{|x-c|}{z}\right|^{2b}}$

(4)

$$trimf(x,a,b,c) = max\left(min\left(\frac{x-1}{b-a},\frac{c-x}{c-b}\right),0\right)$$
(5)

$$gaussmf(x,c,\sigma) = exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{x-c}{\sigma}\right)^2\right)$$
(6)



Fig. 2 Different layer in the ANFIS.

In this paper, the dataset is partitioned into two subsets (80 % as training data and 20 % as testing data). We used ANFIS structure which consists of 5 inputs and one single output. The five inputs represent the student's scores in 5 courses and the GPA was the output. The fuzzy rules are constructed from the membership functions (MF). The ANFIS model consists of three membership functions to build the ANFIS model.

3.3 Performance Evaluation of the Proposed Model

The Root Mean Square Error is used to measure the accuracy of the students' performance prediction by finding the difference between performance of the actual observed data values and the ones predicted by the model. The RMSE is computed as follows:

$$RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_{obs,i} - X_{model,i})^2}{n}}$$
(7)

where X_{obs} denotes the observed performance and X_{model} is the predicted performance.

4. Experimental Results and Discussion

Various experiments were conducted using the three ANFIS models (ANFIS-GaussMF, ANFIS-TriMF and ANFIS-GbellMF). The ANFIS models were trained using the training data subset, while the test data subset was used to evaluate the prediction accuracy of the trained ANFIS models. In addressing the prediction of students' performance, student scores in the previous semester were used as inputs to the ANFIS models.

The optimal ANFIS model will be nominated based on the testing RMSE values for different epoch numbers. The performance of the three ANFIS models based on three types of membership functions (GaussMF, TriMF, and GbellMF) is evaluated by varying the number of training epoch from 100 to 1000 as shown in table 1. The table depicts results which reflect that ANFIS model showed significant variation in its performance based on the type of membership function in use. The testing RMSE values for the three ANFIS models ranged from 0.193 to 0.777. The ANFIS-GbellMF model achieved the best students' performance prediction with RMSE of 0.193 in 1000 epochs, followed by the ANFIS-GaussMF model with RMSE of 0.216 in 1000 epochs respectively. The ANFIS-TriMF performs poorly and predicts the students' performance with RMSE of 0.754 which is less accurate than the other models.

Training Error Testing Error 100 Gauss 0.624 0.712 100 TRIMF 0.027 0.777 100 Gbell 0.708 0.759 200 Gauss 0.172 0.221 200 TRIMF 0.026 0.777 200 Gbell 0.166 0.212 300 Gauss 0.152 0.289 300 Gauss 0.152 0.289 300 Gauss 0.15 0.275 400 Gauss 0.15 0.275 400 Gauss 0.15 0.275 400 Gauss 0.149 0.215 400 Gauss 0.147 0.204 500 Gauss 0.147 0.204 500 Gauss 0.149 0.254 500 Gauss 0.147 0.198 600 Gauss 0.152 0.289 600 Gauss 0.147 0.196	No of Epochs	Membership function Type	Root mean square error	
Error Error 100 Gauss 0.624 0.712 100 TRIMF 0.027 0.777 100 Gbell 0.708 0.759 200 Gauss 0.172 0.221 200 TRIMF 0.026 0.777 200 Gbell 0.166 0.212 300 Gauss 0.152 0.289 300 Gauss 0.152 0.776 300 Gauss 0.15 0.215 400 Gauss 0.15 0.275 400 Gauss 0.15 0.275 400 Gauss 0.149 0.215 400 Gbell 0.147 0.204 500 Gauss 0.149 0.254 500 Gauss 0.147 0.198 600 Gauss 0.152 0.289 600 Gauss 0.147 0.196 700 Gauss 0.147 0.196 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>Training</td><td>Testing</td></td<>			Training	Testing
100 Gauss 0.624 0.712 100 TRIMF 0.027 0.777 100 Gbell 0.708 0.759 200 Gauss 0.172 0.221 200 TRIMF 0.026 0.777 200 Gbell 0.166 0.212 300 Gauss 0.152 0.289 300 Gauss 0.152 0.776 300 Gbell 0.149 0.215 400 Gauss 0.15 0.275 400 Gauss 0.15 0.275 400 Gbell 0.147 0.204 500 Gauss 0.149 0.254 500 Gauss 0.147 0.198 600 Gauss 0.147 0.198 600 Gauss 0.152 0.289 600 Gauss 0.147 0.196 700 Gauss 0.147 0.196 700 Gauss 0.147			Error	Error
100 TRIMF 0.027 0.777 100 Gbell 0.708 0.759 200 Gauss 0.172 0.221 200 TRIMF 0.026 0.777 200 Gbell 0.166 0.212 300 Gauss 0.152 0.289 300 Gauss 0.152 0.776 300 Gbell 0.149 0.215 400 Gauss 0.15 0.275 400 Gauss 0.149 0.215 400 Gauss 0.147 0.204 500 Gauss 0.147 0.204 500 Gauss 0.147 0.198 600 Gauss 0.152 0.289 600 Gauss 0.152 0.289 600 Gauss 0.152 0.289 600 Gauss 0.147 0.196 700 Gauss 0.147 0.196 700 Gauss 0.147	100	Gauss	0.624	0.712
100 Gbell 0.708 0.759 200 Gauss 0.172 0.221 200 TRIMF 0.026 0.777 200 Gbell 0.166 0.212 300 Gauss 0.152 0.289 300 TRIMF 0.025 0.776 300 Gbell 0.149 0.215 400 Gauss 0.15 0.275 400 Gauss 0.15 0.275 400 Gauss 0.149 0.254 500 Gauss 0.149 0.254 500 Gauss 0.149 0.254 500 Gauss 0.147 0.198 600 Gauss 0.147 0.198 600 Gauss 0.147 0.198 600 Gauss 0.147 0.196 700 Gauss 0.147 0.196 700 Gauss 0.147 0.226 800 Gauss 0.147	100	TRIMF	0.027	0.777
200 Gauss 0.172 0.221 200 TRIMF 0.026 0.777 200 Gbell 0.166 0.212 300 Gauss 0.152 0.289 300 TRIMF 0.025 0.776 300 Gbell 0.149 0.215 400 Gauss 0.15 0.275 400 Gauss 0.15 0.275 400 Gauss 0.149 0.214 500 Gauss 0.147 0.204 500 Gauss 0.149 0.254 500 Gauss 0.149 0.254 500 Gauss 0.147 0.198 600 Gauss 0.152 0.289 600 Gauss 0.152 0.289 600 Gauss 0.152 0.289 600 Gbell 0.147 0.196 700 Gauss 0.147 0.196 700 Gauss 0.147	100	Gbell	0.708	0.759
200 TRIMF 0.026 0.777 200 Gbell 0.166 0.212 300 Gauss 0.152 0.289 300 TRIMF 0.025 0.776 300 Gbell 0.149 0.215 400 Gauss 0.15 0.275 400 Gauss 0.147 0.204 500 Gauss 0.147 0.204 500 Gauss 0.149 0.254 500 Gbell 0.147 0.198 600 Gauss 0.152 0.289 600 Gauss 0.147 0.196 700 Gauss 0.147 0.196 700 Gauss 0.147	200	Gauss	0.172	0.221
200 Gbell 0.166 0.212 300 Gauss 0.152 0.289 300 TRIMF 0.025 0.776 300 Gbell 0.149 0.215 400 Gauss 0.15 0.275 400 Gauss 0.15 0.275 400 TRIMF 0.02 0.765 400 Gbell 0.147 0.204 500 Gauss 0.149 0.254 500 Gbell 0.147 0.198 600 Gauss 0.152 0.289 600 Gauss 0.152 0.289 600 Gbell 0.147 0.198 600 Gbell 0.147 0.196 700 Gauss 0.148 0.231 700 Gauss 0.147 0.196 800 Gauss 0.147 0.226 800 Gbell 0.147 0.226 800 Gbell 0.146 <	200	TRIMF	0.026	0.777
300 Gauss 0.152 0.289 300 TRIMF 0.025 0.776 300 Gbell 0.149 0.215 400 Gauss 0.15 0.275 400 Gauss 0.15 0.275 400 TRIMF 0.02 0.765 400 Gbell 0.147 0.204 500 Gauss 0.149 0.254 500 TRIMF 0.02 0.764 500 Gbell 0.147 0.198 600 Gauss 0.152 0.289 600 Gauss 0.152 0.289 600 Gbell 0.147 0.196 700 Gauss 0.148 0.231 700 Gauss 0.148 0.231 700 Gauss 0.147 0.196 800 Gauss 0.147 0.226 800 Gbell 0.147 0.221 900 Gauss 0.147 <t< td=""><td>200</td><td>Gbell</td><td>0.166</td><td>0.212</td></t<>	200	Gbell	0.166	0.212
300 TRIMF 0.025 0.776 300 Gbell 0.149 0.215 400 Gauss 0.15 0.275 400 TRIMF 0.02 0.765 400 Gbell 0.147 0.204 500 Gauss 0.149 0.254 500 Gauss 0.149 0.254 500 Gbell 0.147 0.198 600 Gbell 0.147 0.198 600 Gauss 0.152 0.289 600 Gauss 0.152 0.289 600 Gbell 0.147 0.196 700 Gauss 0.148 0.231 700 Gauss 0.147 0.196 700 Gauss 0.147 0.196 800 Gauss 0.147 0.226 800 Gauss 0.147 0.221 900 Gauss 0.147 0.221 900 Gauss 0.146	300	Gauss	0.152	0.289
300 Gbell 0.149 0.215 400 Gauss 0.15 0.275 400 TRIMF 0.02 0.765 400 Gbell 0.147 0.204 500 Gauss 0.149 0.254 500 TRIMF 0.02 0.764 500 Gbell 0.147 0.198 600 Gauss 0.152 0.289 600 Gauss 0.152 0.289 600 Gauss 0.152 0.289 600 Gauss 0.152 0.289 600 Gauss 0.147 0.196 700 Gauss 0.147 0.196 700 Gauss 0.147 0.196 700 Gbell 0.147 0.226 800 Gauss 0.147 0.226 800 Gbell 0.146 0.195 900 Gauss 0.147 0.221 900 Gauss 0.147 <	300	TRIMF	0.025	0.776
400 Gauss 0.15 0.275 400 TRIMF 0.02 0.765 400 Gbell 0.147 0.204 500 Gauss 0.149 0.254 500 TRIMF 0.02 0.764 500 Gbell 0.147 0.198 600 Gbell 0.147 0.198 600 Gauss 0.152 0.289 600 Gauss 0.152 0.289 600 Gauss 0.147 0.196 600 Gbell 0.147 0.196 600 Gbell 0.147 0.196 700 Gauss 0.148 0.231 700 TRIMF 0.02 0.764 700 Gbell 0.147 0.196 800 Gauss 0.147 0.226 800 Gbell 0.146 0.195 900 Gauss 0.147 0.221 900 Gbell 0.146 <t< td=""><td>300</td><td>Gbell</td><td>0.149</td><td>0.215</td></t<>	300	Gbell	0.149	0.215
400 TRIMF 0.02 0.765 400 Gbell 0.147 0.204 500 Gauss 0.149 0.254 500 TRIMF 0.02 0.764 500 Gbell 0.147 0.198 600 Gbell 0.147 0.198 600 Gauss 0.152 0.289 600 Gbell 0.147 0.198 600 Gauss 0.152 0.289 600 Gbell 0.147 0.196 700 Gauss 0.148 0.231 700 Gauss 0.148 0.231 700 Gauss 0.147 0.196 800 Gauss 0.147 0.226 800 Gauss 0.147 0.226 800 Gbell 0.146 0.195 900 Gauss 0.147 0.221 900 Gauss 0.147 0.221 900 Gbell 0.146	400	Gauss	0.15	0.275
400 Gbell 0.147 0.204 500 Gauss 0.149 0.254 500 TRIMF 0.02 0.764 500 Gbell 0.147 0.198 600 Gauss 0.152 0.289 600 TRIMF 0.02 0.764 600 Gauss 0.152 0.289 600 TRIMF 0.02 0.764 600 Gbell 0.147 0.196 700 Gauss 0.148 0.231 700 Gauss 0.148 0.231 700 Gauss 0.147 0.196 800 Gbell 0.147 0.196 800 Gauss 0.147 0.226 800 Gbell 0.146 0.195 900 Gauss 0.147 0.221 900 Gauss 0.147 0.221 900 Gbell 0.146 0.194 1000 Gauss 0.147	400	TRIMF	0.02	0.765
500 Gauss 0.149 0.254 500 TRIMF 0.02 0.764 500 Gbell 0.147 0.198 600 Gauss 0.152 0.289 600 Gauss 0.152 0.289 600 TRIMF 0.02 0.764 600 Gbell 0.147 0.196 600 Gbell 0.147 0.196 700 Gauss 0.148 0.231 700 Gauss 0.148 0.231 700 Gauss 0.147 0.196 800 Gauss 0.147 0.226 800 Gbell 0.147 0.226 800 Gbell 0.146 0.195 900 Gauss 0.147 0.221 900 Gauss 0.147 0.221 900 Gbell 0.146 0.194 1000 Gauss 0.147 0.216 1000 Gbell 0.146	400	Gbell	0.147	0.204
500 TRIMF 0.02 0.764 500 Gbell 0.147 0.198 600 Gauss 0.152 0.289 600 TRIMF 0.02 0.764 600 Gauss 0.152 0.289 600 TRIMF 0.02 0.764 600 Gbell 0.147 0.196 600 Gauss 0.148 0.231 700 Gauss 0.148 0.231 700 Gbell 0.147 0.196 800 Gbell 0.147 0.196 800 Gauss 0.147 0.226 800 TRIMF 0.019 0.759 800 Gbell 0.146 0.195 900 Gauss 0.147 0.221 900 TRIMF 0.019 0.756 900 Gbell 0.146 0.194 1000 Gauss 0.147 0.216 1000 TRIMF 0.018	500	Gauss	0.149	0.254
500 Gbell 0.147 0.198 600 Gauss 0.152 0.289 600 TRIMF 0.02 0.764 600 Gbell 0.147 0.196 600 Gbell 0.147 0.196 700 Gauss 0.148 0.231 700 Gauss 0.148 0.231 700 Gauss 0.147 0.196 800 Gbell 0.147 0.196 800 Gauss 0.147 0.226 800 TRIMF 0.019 0.759 800 Gbell 0.146 0.195 900 Gauss 0.147 0.221 900 Gauss 0.147 0.221 900 Gbell 0.146 0.194 1000 Gauss 0.147 0.216 1000 TRIMF 0.018 0.754 1000 Gbell 0.146 0.193	500	TRIMF	0.02	0.764
600 Gauss 0.152 0.289 600 TRIMF 0.02 0.764 600 Gbell 0.147 0.196 700 Gauss 0.148 0.231 700 TRIMF 0.02 0.764 700 Gauss 0.148 0.231 700 TRIMF 0.02 0.764 700 Gbell 0.147 0.196 800 Gauss 0.147 0.196 800 Gauss 0.147 0.226 800 TRIMF 0.019 0.759 800 Gbell 0.146 0.195 900 Gauss 0.147 0.221 900 TRIMF 0.019 0.756 900 Gbell 0.146 0.194 1000 Gauss 0.147 0.216 1000 TRIMF 0.018 0.754 1000 Gbell 0.146 0.193	500	Gbell	0.147	0.198
600 TRIMF 0.02 0.764 600 Gbell 0.147 0.196 700 Gauss 0.148 0.231 700 TRIMF 0.02 0.764 700 Gauss 0.148 0.231 700 TRIMF 0.02 0.764 700 Gbell 0.147 0.196 800 Gauss 0.147 0.226 800 Gauss 0.147 0.226 800 TRIMF 0.019 0.759 800 Gbell 0.146 0.195 900 Gauss 0.147 0.221 900 TRIMF 0.019 0.756 900 Gbell 0.146 0.194 1000 Gauss 0.147 0.216 1000 TRIMF 0.018 0.754 1000 Gbell 0.146 0.193	600	Gauss	0.152	0.289
600 Gbell 0.147 0.196 700 Gauss 0.148 0.231 700 TRIMF 0.02 0.764 700 Gbell 0.147 0.196 700 Gbell 0.147 0.196 800 Gauss 0.147 0.226 800 Gauss 0.147 0.226 800 TRIMF 0.019 0.759 800 Gbell 0.146 0.195 900 Gauss 0.147 0.221 900 Gauss 0.147 0.221 900 Gbell 0.146 0.194 1000 Gauss 0.147 0.216 1000 TRIMF 0.018 0.754 1000 Gbell 0.146 0.193	600	TRIMF	0.02	0.764
700 Gauss 0.148 0.231 700 TRIMF 0.02 0.764 700 Gbell 0.147 0.196 800 Gauss 0.147 0.226 800 Gauss 0.147 0.226 800 TRIMF 0.019 0.759 800 Gbell 0.146 0.195 900 Gauss 0.147 0.221 900 TRIMF 0.019 0.756 900 Gbell 0.146 0.194 1000 Gauss 0.147 0.216 1000 TRIMF 0.018 0.754 1000 Gbell 0.146 0.193	600	Gbell	0.147	0.196
700 TRIMF 0.02 0.764 700 Gbell 0.147 0.196 800 Gauss 0.147 0.226 800 TRIMF 0.019 0.759 800 Gbell 0.146 0.195 900 Gauss 0.147 0.221 900 Gauss 0.147 0.221 900 TRIMF 0.019 0.756 900 Gbell 0.146 0.194 1000 Gauss 0.147 0.216 1000 TRIMF 0.018 0.754 1000 Gbell 0.146 0.193	700	Gauss	0.148	0.231
700 Gbell 0.147 0.196 800 Gauss 0.147 0.226 800 TRIMF 0.019 0.759 800 Gbell 0.146 0.195 800 Gbell 0.147 0.221 900 Gauss 0.147 0.221 900 TRIMF 0.019 0.756 900 Gbell 0.146 0.194 1000 Gauss 0.147 0.216 1000 TRIMF 0.018 0.754 1000 Gbell 0.146 0.193	700	TRIMF	0.02	0.764
800 Gauss 0.147 0.226 800 TRIMF 0.019 0.759 800 Gbell 0.146 0.195 900 Gauss 0.147 0.221 900 Gauss 0.147 0.221 900 TRIMF 0.019 0.756 900 Gbell 0.146 0.194 1000 Gauss 0.147 0.216 1000 TRIMF 0.018 0.754 1000 Gbell 0.146 0.193	700	Gbell	0.147	0.196
800 TRIMF 0.019 0.759 800 Gbell 0.146 0.195 900 Gauss 0.147 0.221 900 TRIMF 0.019 0.756 900 Gbell 0.146 0.194 1000 Gbell 0.146 0.194 1000 Gauss 0.147 0.216 1000 TRIMF 0.018 0.754 1000 Gbell 0.146 0.193	800	Gauss	0.147	0.226
800 Gbell 0.146 0.195 900 Gauss 0.147 0.221 900 TRIMF 0.019 0.756 900 Gbell 0.146 0.194 1000 Gauss 0.147 0.216 1000 TRIMF 0.018 0.754 1000 Gbell 0.146 0.193	800	TRIMF	0.019	0.759
900 Gauss 0.147 0.221 900 TRIMF 0.019 0.756 900 Gbell 0.146 0.194 1000 Gauss 0.147 0.216 1000 TRIMF 0.018 0.754 1000 Gbell 0.146 0.193	800	Gbell	0.146	0.195
900 TRIMF 0.019 0.756 900 Gbell 0.146 0.194 1000 Gauss 0.147 0.216 1000 TRIMF 0.018 0.754 1000 Gbell 0.146 0.193	900	Gauss	0.147	0.221
900 Gbell 0.146 0.194 1000 Gauss 0.147 0.216 1000 TRIMF 0.018 0.754 1000 Gbell 0.146 0.193	900	TRIMF	0.019	0.756
1000 Gauss 0.147 0.216 1000 TRIMF 0.018 0.754 1000 Gbell 0.146 0.193	900	Gbell	0.146	0.194
1000 TRIMF 0.018 0.754 1000 Gbell 0.146 0.193	1000	Gauss	0.147	0.216
1000 Gbell 0.146 0.193	1000	TRIMF	0.018	0.754
	1000	Gbell	0.146	0.193

Table 1: Training and testing RMSE using different types of membership function with different epochs

Figure 3 shows the training RMSE for the three ANFIS models. It is noticeable that for the three models when the number of epochs reaches about 200 iterations, the training RMSE almost reaches a stable value and that means more training to the model will not yield significant results in the prediction accuracy of the ANFIS model and may cause over-fitting of the ANFIS model.



Fig. 3 Training RMSE for the three models with different numbers of training epochs.

Fig.4 clearly shows that the testing RMSE values of the ANFIS-GbellMF is lower than that of ANFIS-GaussMF, while the ANFIS-TriMF achieved the worst testing RMSE.



Figure 4: Testing RMSE for the three models with different numbers of training epochs.

5. Conclusions

Student's performance prediction is important to assist students in improving their academic performance. This paper presented an adaptive neuro fsuzzy inference system for students' performance prediction. The used ANFIS models for student performance prediction utilized three types of membership functions and the backpropagation algorithm for training. ANFIS model based on the generalized bell-shaped membership function (ANFIS-GbellMF) provided superior prediction of the student's performance with a RMSE as low as 0.193. Future work will utilize different data mining approaches and will incorporate larger dataset to achieve results that are more accurate. Data mining approaches such as Clustering can be applied to the dataset before using the ANFIS to improve the prediction capabilities of the models as well as their accuracy.

Acknowledgment

This work was supported by the Deanship of Scientific Research (DSR), King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, under Grant No. (160-830-1437). The authors, therefore, gratefully acknowledge the DSR technical and financial support.

References

- C. Romero, S. Ventura, Educational data mining: A review of the state of the art, Trans. Sys. Man Cyber Part C 40 (6) (2010) 601–618.
- Baker, Ryan Shaun, and Paul Salvador Inventado.
 "Educational data mining and learning analytics." In Learning analytics, pp. 61-75. Springer New York, 2014.
- [3] Chamizo-Gonzalez, Julian, Elisa Isabel Cano-Montero, Elena Urquia-Grande, and Clara Isabel Muñoz-Colomina. "Educational data mining for improving learning outcomes in teaching accounting within higher education." The International Journal of Information and Learning Technology 32, no. 5 (2015): 272-285.
- [4] Romero, C., Ventura, S.: Data mining in education. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery 3(1), 12–27, 2013
- [5] Dawson, S., Gašević, D., Siemens, G., & Joksimovic, S. (2014). Current State and Future Trends: A Citation Network Analysis of the Learning Analytics Field. In Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Learning Analytics And Knowledge (pp. 231–240). New York, NY, USA: ACM.
- [6] Yukselturk E, Ozekes S, Türel YK. Predicting dropout student: an application of data mining methods in an online education program. European Journal of Open, Distance and E-learning. 2014 Jul 1;17(1):118-33.
- [7] Barber, R., & Sharkey, M. Course correction: Using analytics to predict course success. In Proceedings of the 2nd international conference on learning analytics and knowledge, 2012, pp. 259–262. ACM.
- [8] Wolff, A., Zdrahal, Z., Nikolov, A., & Pantucek, M. Improving retention: predicting at-risk students by analysing clicking behaviour in a virtual learning environment. In Proceedings of the third international conference on learning analytics and knowledge, 2013, pp. 145–149. ACM
- [9] A. Sharma, R. Kumar, P. K. Varadwaj, A. Ahmad, and G. M. Ashraf, "A comparative study of support vector machine, artificial neural network and bayesian classifier formutagenicity prediction," Interdisciplinary Sciences, Computational Life Sciences, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 232–239, 2011.
- [10] B. K. Bhardwaj and S. Pal, "Data mining: a prediction for performance improvement using classification," International Journal of Computer Science and Information Security, vol. 9, no.4, pp. 1–5, 2011.

- [11] N. T. Nghe, P. Janecek, and P. Haddawy, "A comparative analysis of techniques for predicting academic performance," in Proceedings of the 37th ASEE/IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference (FIE '07), pp.T2– G7,Milwaukee,Wis,USA,October 2007.
- [12] S. Huang and N. Fang, "Predicting student academic performance in an engineering dynamics course: a comparison of four types of predictive mathematical models," Computers & Education, vol. 61, pp. 133–145, 2013.
- [13] R. Singh, A. Kainthola, and T. N. Singh, "Estimation of elastic constant of rocks using an ANFIS approach," Applied Soft Computing Journal, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 40–45, 2012.
- [14] J.-S. R. Jang, "ANFIS: adaptive-network-based fuzzy inference system," IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 665–685, 1993.
- [15] K. S. Pal and S. Mitra, Neuro-Fuzzy Pattern Recognition: Methods in Soft Computing, JohnWiley & Sons, New York, NY, USA, 1999.
- [16] Jai Ruby & K. David, "Predicting the Performance of Students in Higher Education Using Data Mining Classification Algorithms – A Case Study ", IJRASET International Journal for Research in Applied Science & Engineering Technology, Volume 2 Issue XI, November 2014
- [17] Naser, S. A., Zaqout, I., Ghosh, M. A., Atallah, R., & Alajrami, E. Predicting Student Performance Using Artificial Neural Network: in the Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology. International Journal of Hybrid Information Technology, 8(2),pp 221-228, 2015.
- [18] Ajith P., Tejaswi B, Sai MSS. Rule Mining Framework for Students Performance Evaluation. International Journal of Soft Computing and Engineering. 2013; 2(6):201–6.
- [19] Kamber, Jiawei Han & Micheline. Data Mining: Concepts and Techniques second edition. San Francisco : Morgan Kaufmann, 2006.
- [20] Jang, J. S. R., ANFIS: adaptive-network based fuzzy inference system. IEEE Trans. Syst., Man, Cybernetics, 1993, 23(3), 665–685.
- [21] M. Alizadeh, R. Rada, A.K.G. Balagh, M.M.S. Esfahani, Forecasting Exchange Rates: A Neuro-Fuzzy Approach, IFSA-EUSFLAT, 2009, pp.1745-1750.