九州大学学術情報リポジトリ
Kyushu University Institutional Repository

Efficiency of LSA and K-means in Predicting Students' Academic Performance Based on Their Comments Data

Sorour, Shaymaa E.
Faculty of Specific Education, Kafr Elsheik University | Graduate School of Information Science and ElectricalEngineering, Kyushu University

Mine, Tsunenori
Faculty of Information Science and Electrical Engineering, Kyushu University

Goda, Kazumasa
Kyushu Institute of Information Science

Hirokawa, Sachio
Research Institute for Information Technology, Kyushu University

https://hdl.handle.net/2324/1498218

出版情報：Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Computer Supported Education. 1, pp.63-74, 2014
バージョン：
権利関係：

Efficiency of LSA and K-means in Predicting Students' Academic Performance Based on Their Comments Data

Shaymaa E. Sorour[1,2], Tsunenori Mine[3], Kazumasa Goda[4] and Sachio Hirokawa[5]
[1]*Faculty of Specific Education, Kafr Elsheik University, 33516 El-Gaish Street, KafrElsheikh, Egypt*
[2]*Graduate School of Information Science and Electrical Engineering, Kyushu University, 744 Motooka Nishiku, Fukuoka, Japan*
[3]*Faculty of Information Science and Electrical Engineering, Kyushu University, 744 Motooka Nishiku, Fukuoka, Japan*
[4]*Kyushu Institute of Information Science, 6-3-1 Saifu, Dazaifu, Fukuoka, Japan*
[5]*Research Institute for Information Technology, Kyushu University, 6-10-1 Hakozaki Higashi-ku, Fukuoka, Japan*
shaymaa_ezz_2006@yahoo.com, mine@ait.kyushu-u.ac.jp, gouda@kiis.ac.jp, hirokawa@cc.kyushu-u.ac.jp

Keywords: Freestyle Comments, PCN Method, LSA, K-means Cluster Algorithm.

Abstract: Predicting students' academic performance has long been an important research topic in many academic disciplines. The prediction will help the tutors identify the weak students and help them score better marks; these steps were taken to improve the performance of the students. The present study uses free style comments written by students after each lesson. These comments reflect their learning attitudes to the lesson, understanding of subjects, difficulties to learn, and learning activities in the classroom. (Goda and Mine, 2011) proposed PCN method to estimate students' learning situations from their comments freely written by themselves. This paper uses C (Current) method from the PCN method. The C method only uses comments with C item that focuses on students' understanding and achievements during the class period. The aims of this study are, by applying the method to the students' comments, to clarify relationships between student's behaviour and their success, and to develop a model of students' performance predictors. To this end, we use Latent Semantic Analyses (LSA) and K-means clustering techniques. The results of this study reported a model of students' academic performance predictors by analysing their comment data as variables of predictors.

1 INTRODUCTION

The topic of explanation and prediction of students' academic performance is widely researched. The ability to predict their performance is very important in educational environments. Increasing students' success is a long-term goal in all academic institutions. If educational institutions can predict their academic performance before their final examination as early as possible, extra efforts can be taken to arrange proper support for them, in particular lower performance students to improve their studies and help them success. Many researchers tried to predict students' behaviors in educational environments based upon diverse factors like personal, social, psychological, and other environmental variables. Various experiments have been carried out in this area.

This paper also proposes a method for predicting students' grades. Unlike previous studies, our method is based on students' freestyle comments collected in their class. The students' comments are good resources to predict their learning situations. Each student writes his/her comments after a lesson; the student looks back upon his/her learning behavior and situation; he/she can express about his/her attitudes, difficulties, and any other information that help a teacher estimate his/her learning activities.

(Goda and Mine, 2011) proposed the PCN method to estimate students' learning situations from freestyle comments written by the students. The PCN method categorizes the students' comments into three items of **P** (Previous activity), **C** (Current activity), and **N** (Next activity). It provides data expressing students' learning status, also index reducing the task for all of their self-observations, self-judgments, and self-reactions. However (Goda and Mine, 2011) did not discuss prediction of students' grades.

In this paper we propose a prediction method of students' grades using comments with C item (C

comments in short). Our proposed method is as follows:

- We analyzed C comments by using Mecab program*, which is a Japanese morphological analyzer to extract words and their part of speech (verb, noun, adjective, and adverb).
- We applied LSA to extracted words and comments matrix so that we can identify patterns and relationships between the extracted words and latent concepts contained in unstructured collection of texts (students' comments).
- We classified the results of LSA into 5 groups by using K-means clustering method.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 summaries related work in an application of prediction of students' performance by data or text mining techniques in educational environments; Section 3 describes our students' grade prediction method, explaining related methods such as LSA and K-means clustering algorithm; Section 4 discusses experimental results of students' final grade predictions. Finally, we conclude this paper with a summary and describe an outlook for future work.

2 RELATED WORK

The main objective of any higher educational institution is to improve the quality of managerial decisions and to impart quality education. Good prediction of student's success in higher learning institution is one way to reach the highest level of quality in higher education systems.

Various experiments have been carried out in this area to predict students' academic performance. To predict students' marks in the end of their semester, (Bharadwaj and Pal, 2011a) used the students' marks of their previous semester, test grade in their previous class, seminar performance, assignment performance, general proficiency, attendance in their class and lab work. (Bharadwaj and Pal, 2011b) also conducted another study on students' performance, selecting 300 students from 5 different degree colleges in India. They found that students' academic performance were highly correlated with their grades in senior secondary exam, living location, medium of teaching, mother's qualification, family annual income, and their family status. Using students' attendance, test grade in their class, seminar and assignment marks, and lab works, (Yadav et al., 2011) predicted their performance at the end of the semester with help of three decision tree algorithms: ID3, CART, and C4.5, and achieved 52.08%, 56.25%, and 45.83% classification accuracy, respectively. (Kovacic, 2010) used students' enrollment data to predict successful and unsuccessful student in New Zealand, and achieved 59.4% and 60.5% of classification accuracy when using decision tree algorithms: CHAID and CART, respectively. (Sembiring et al., 2011) found that students' interest, study behaviour, learning time, and family support are significantly correlated with their academic performance. (Osmanbegović and Suljić, 2012) applied three supervised data mining algorithms (Naïve Bayes, neural network, decision tree) to the preoperative assessment data, to predict students' pass or failure in a course; They evaluated prediction performace of the learning methods based on their predictive accuracy, ease of learning, and user friendly characteristics. The results indicated that the Naïve Bayes classifier outperforms, on its predictive accuracy, decision tree and neural network methods. (Kabakchieva, 2013) focused on the implementation of data mining techniques and methods for acquiring new knowledge from data collected by universities. The main goals of the research are to reveal the high potential of data mining applications for university management, to find out if there are any patterns in the available data that could be useful for predicting students' performance at the university based on their personal and pre-university characteristics. Kabakchieva classified students' level into five distinct categories (excellent, very good, good, average, and bad); they were determined from the total university score achieved by the students. The experimental study classified data by decision tree algorithm (C4.5 and J48), Bayesian classifiers (NaiveBayes and BayesNet), a Nearest Neighbour algorithm (IBk) and two rule learners (OneR and JRip). The results indicated that the prediction rates were not remarkable (vary between 52 and 67%). Moreover, the classifiers perform differently for the five classes. The data attributes related to the students' university admission score and number of failures at the first-year university exams are among the factors influencing most the classification process. (Adhatrao et al., 2013) built a system to predict students' performance from their previous performances using concepts of data mining techniques under classification. They analyzed the data set containing information about the students, such as gender, marks scored in the board examinations, marks and rank in entrance

* http://sourceforge.net/projects/mecab/

examinations and results in the first year of the previous batch of the students. They applyed ID3 and C4.5 classification algorithms, and predicted the general and individual performance of freshly admitted students in future examinations. The accuracy result is 75.15% for both ID3 and C4.5 algorithms. (Antai et al., 2011) classified a set of documents according to document topic areas by using CLUTO program with and without LSA. The results showed that the internal cluster similarity with LSA was much higher than that without LSA.

According to the previous studies mentioned above, external data beside students' marks in the previous year are important to predict their performance. On the other hand, using suitable data mining techniques related to input data will give better results than others.

(Bachtiar et al., 2012) developed an estimation model to predict students' English ability (listening, reading, speaking, and writing) skills and performance. They proposed a questionnaire to quantify students' affective factors with three major factors: motivation, attitude, and personality. The components of each of these factors are further identified by exploring each factor conceptually. They applied a neural network model in their experiments. The accuracy scores obtained by the model were 93.3% for listening, 94.4% for reading, 94.9% for speaking, and 93.6% for writing skills. (Minami and Ohura, 2013) analysed students' attitude towards learning, and investigated how it affects their final evaluation; they pursued a case study of lecture data analysis in which the correlations between students' attitude to learning such as attendance and homework as effort, and the students' examination scores as achievement; they analyzed the students' own evaluation on themselves and lectures based on a questionnaire; they also introduced a new measuring index named self-confidence, to investigate the correlations between self-confidence, self-evaluation, lecture evaluation, effort, and achievement scores. Through this study, they showed that a lecturer can give feedback data to students who tend to over-evaluate themselves, and let the students recognize their real positions in the class.

From the two studies, we need to understand individual students more deeply, recognize students' learning status and attitude to give feedbacks to them. Although applying questionnaire gave good results than previous data (e.g. personality, sociality, and students' behaviour), we need to understand students' characteristics more deeply by letting them describe themselves about their educational situations such as understanding of subjects, difficulties to learn, learning activities in the classroom, and their attitude toward the lesson. Researchers have used various classification methods and various data in their studies to predict students' academic performance.

Different from the above studies, (Goda and Mine, 2011) proposed PCN method to estimate students' learning situations with their freestyle comments written just after lesson. The PCN method categorizes their comments into three items: **P** (Previous), **C** (Current), and **N** (Next) so that it can analyze the comments from the points of views of their time-oriented learning situations. (Goda et al., 2013) proposed PCN scores for determing the validity level of assessment to students' comments and showed there exist strong correlations between the PCN scores and accuracy of predicting students' final grades. First, they employed multiple regression analysis to calculate PCN scores and the results indicated that students who wrote comments with high PCN scores are considered as those who describe the students' learning attitude appropriately. Second, they applied machine learning method Support Vector Machine (SVM) to the comments for predicting the students' final results in five grades of S, A, B, C, and D. The experimental results illustrated that as students' comments get higher PCN scores, prediction performance of the students' grades becomes higher. Goda et al., however, did not discuss prediction performance of students' final grades.

In this study, as an extention of (Goda et al., 2013), we focus on prediction performance of students' final grades. Using C comments from PCN method, we try to predict their grade in each lesson and discuss change of accuracy in a sequence of the lessons.

In the following section, we describe our method for predicting students' performance.

3 STUDENTS' GRADE PREDICTION METHOD

3.1 Overall Procedures of Proposed Method

Figure 1 displays the overall procedures of our proposed method; we have five phases:

1- Comments Data Collection: This phase focuses on collecting comments from students after each lesson. In this case, we use comments data



Figure 1: Overall procedures of the proposed method.

collected previously from (Goda and Mine, 2011). We choose C comments that describe the current activities of the students during the class period. (See Section 3.2)

2- Data Preparation: The data preparation phase covers all the activities required to construct the final dataset from the initial raw data. Our method analyses comments data by extracting words and part of speech, calculating the word frequencies, applying log entropy weighting method so as to balance the effect of occurrence frequency of words in all the comments (See Section 3.3), and applying LSA technique to reduce the dimensions of a matrix and obtain the most significant vectors. (See Section 3.4)

3- Training Phase: In this phase, we classify LSA results into 5 clusters by using K-means clustering method. (See Section 3.5)

4- Test Phase: This phase revolves on extracting words from a new comment, and transforming an extracted-words vector of the comment to a set of k-dimensional vector (KDV) by using LSA.

We identify the nearest cluster center to the comment, among the 5 clusters created in the training phase, and return the dominant grade in the cluster. (See Section 4)

5- Noisy Data Detection: we detect noisy data from the points of view of grade prediction. We conduct the detection in two phases: training phase and test phase. In the training phase, we calculate Standard deviation (***Sd***) to each cluster. In the test phase, we measure the average distance between a new comment and cluster centers. (See Section 3.6)

3.2 PCN Method and Students' Grade

Goda collected free-style comments of 123 students in two classes who attended his programming exercise course. The course had 15 lessons and the students' comments were collected every lesson (Goda and Mine, 2011).

Each student described his/her learning tendency, attitudes, and understanding for each lesson. Goda prepared the fill in forms for their comments. The form consists of four items: P, C, N and O. The explanations of the items are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Viewpoint Categories of Students' Comments.

Viewpoint	Meaning
P (Previous)	The learning activity before the class time such as review of previous class and preparation for the coming class. For example, "I read chapter 3 of the textbook."
C (Current)	The understanding and achievements of class subjects during the class time. For example, "I didn't finish all exercise because time is up."
N (Next)	The learning activity plan until the next class. For example, "I will make preparation by next class."
O (Other)	Other descriptions

The main idea of their research was to grasp students' learning status in the class, and illustrate the validity of the PCN method.

In their another study, (Goda et al., 2013) proposed PCN score to judge the appropriateness of students' comments and the way to automatically calculate the score with high accuracy; they also

showed there exist strong correlations between the PCN score and prediction performance of students' grades by applying SVM to their comments. They chose five grades instead of mark itself as students' results. Table 2 shows the correspondence between the grades and the range of marks in the exam. The results of their method are shown in Table 3, where C comments get higher results at the head of grades: S, A, and B, compared with P and N comments.

In this research, we have chosen C comments from (Goda et al., 2013); C comments show understanding and achievements of class subjects during the class time as shown in Table 1.

Table 2: The correspondence between grades and the range of marks.

Grade	Scores
S	90-100
A	80-89
B	70-79
C	60-69
D	0-59

Table 3: Correlation Coefficient of PCN-score and student grades (Goda et al., 2013).

	P	C	N
S	0.3356	0.7956	0.6700
A	0.2647	0.8624	0.7829
B	0.7465	0.8263	0.7076
C	0.7631	0.6602	0.5380
D	0.7355	0.4955	0.2079

3.3 Term Weighting to Comments

After choosing C comments, we use a Japanese morphological analyzer Mecab to analyze each sentence for extracting words and their part of speech (noun, verb, adjective, and adverb).

In preparing for LSA, the text is modeled in a standard word-by-comment matrix (Salton and McGill, 1983) by extracting words from the natural language text. We follow procedures established for extracting keywords from the comments. This word-by-comment matrix *A* shown in Table 4 is comprised of *m* words $w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_i, \ldots, w_m$ in *n* comments $c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_j, \ldots, c_n$, where the value of each cell a_{ij} of *A* represents a local term frequency tf_{ij} that indicates the number of occurrence of word "w_i" in comment "c_j." To balance the effect of word frequencies in all comments, log entropy term weighting method is applied to the original word-by-comment matrix, which is the basis for all subsequent analyses (Botana et al., 2010); we apply a global weighting function to each nonzero element of a_{ij} of *A* to improve retrieval performance.

The global weighting function transforms each cell a_{ij} of *A* to a global term weight g_i, which is entropy of w_i for the entire collection of comments (Landauer, T., et al., 2013 & Dumais, 1991).

Here, g_i is calculated as follows:

Global Term Weight g_i	$g_i = 1 + \Sigma_{j=1,n} (p_{ij} \log (p_{ij}) / \log (n)$ where $p_{ij} = L_{ij} / gf_i$, $L_{ij} = \log (tf_{ij} + 1)$; tf_{ij} is the number of occurrence of w_i in c_j, gf_i is the number of occurrence of word w_i in all comments, and n is the number of all the comments.

Table 5 shows the results generated after applying log entropy weighting method, where the rows refer to words, and columns refer to C comments.

Table 4: Word by comment matrix.

Word	Com 1	Com 2	Com 3	Com 4	Com 5	Com6	Com 7	Com 8
Level	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
Setting	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
Understand	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
Do	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Opertion	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
Exist	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
Connection	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
Suffer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
What	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0
Screen	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Treatment	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0

Table 5: An example of log entropy term weighting.

Word	Com 1	Com 2	Com 3	Com 4	Com 5	Com6	Com 7	Com 8
Level	0.45	0	0.45	0	0.45	0.45	0	0.45
Setting	0	0.71	0	0.71	0	0	0	0.71
Understand	0.58	0	0	0.58	0	0	0.58	0.58
Do	0.99	0	0	0	0	0.99	0	0
Opertion	0	0.71	0	0.71	0	0.71	0	0
Exist	0	0	0.99	0	0	0	0	0.99
Connection	0.58	0	0	0.58	0	0	0.58	0.58
Suffer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
What	0	0.71	0	0	0.71	0	0.71	0
Screen	0	0	0.99	0	0	0	0.99	0
Treatment	0.71	0	0	0.71	0	0	0.71	0

3.4 Latent Semantic Analysis

LSA has been defined in different ways by different researchers. (Dumais, 1991) defined LSA as a statistical information retrieval technique, designed for the purpose of reducing the problems of

synonymy and polysemy in information retrieval. LSA is also defined as a theory and method for extracting and representing the contextual-usage meaning of words by statistical computations applied to a large corpus of text (Landauer and Dumais, 1997). The underlying idea is that the aggregate of all the word contexts in which a given word does and does not appear provides a set of mutual constraints that largely determine the similarity of meaning of words and sets of words to each other. The mathematical foundation for LSA lies in singular value decomposition (SVD), which is a matrix approximation method for reducing the dimensions of a matrix to the most significant vectors. Here we assume matrix A of dimension m×n, where m is the total number of words, and n is the total number of comments, is defined as $A=USV^T$, where U (m×n) and V^T (n×n) are the left and right singular matrices (orthonormal) respectively, and S (n×n) is the diagonal matrix of singular values. SVD yields a simple strategy to obtain an optimal approximation for A using smaller matrices. If the singular values in S are ordered descending by size, the first k largest may be kept and the remaining smaller ones set to zero. The product of the resulting k-reduced matrices is a matrix $\tilde{A}$, which is approximately equal to A in the least squares sense and of the same rank. That is, $\tilde{A} \approx A = USV^T$ (Berry et al., 1995). A pictorial representation of the SVD of input matrix A and the best rank–k approximation to A can be seen in Figure 2. The baseline theory for LSA in text processing is that by looking at the entire range of words chosen in a wide variety of texts, patterns will emerge in terms of word choice as well as word and document meaning.



Figure 2: Diagram of the truncated SVD, the blue colour illustrates how to reduce the range of data (Berry et al., 1995; Witter and Berry, 1998).

The number of singular dimensions to retain is an open issue in the latent semantic analysis literature. Based on the research (Hill et al., 2002) retaining dimensions 2 to 101 resulted in satisfactory performance.

In this research, we apply LSA to the word by comment matrix as shown in Table 6, and retaining only the first four ranks by keeping the first four columns of U, V, and S.

Table 6: Results of k dimensional vector (KDV).

$$\tilde{A} = \begin{vmatrix} 0.649 & 0.733 & 0.263 & 0.073 \\ 0.926 & 0.977 & 0.783 & 0.701 \\ 0.489 & 0.465 & 0.357 & 0.241 \\ 0.521 & 0.544 & 0.434 & 0.381 \\ 0.543 & 0.551 & -0.217 & 0.176 \\ 0.275 & 0.291 & 0.375 & 0.249 \\ 0.496 & -0.469 & 0.502 & 0.007 \\ 0.423 & 0.426 & 0.347 & 0.138 \\ 0.583 & 0.571 & -0.43 & 0.307 \\ 0.445 & 0.444 & 0.308 & 0.219 \\ 0.398 & 0.404 & -0.384 & 0.2 \\ 0.64 & -0.658 & -0.328 & 0.121 \\ 0.443 & 0.433 & 0.512 & 0.374 \end{vmatrix}$$

3.5 Clustering

One of the definitions given of clustering by (Zaiane,1999), is a process in which a set of objects are split into a set of structured sub-classes, bearing a strong similarity to each other, such that they can be safely treated as a group. Such sub-classes are referred to as clusters. (Csorba and Vajk, 2006) define document clustering as a procedure which is used to divide documents based on certain criterion, like topics, with the expectation that the clustering process should recognize these topics and subsequently place the documents in the categories to which they belong. Various clustering algorithms, which work in different ways, have been proposed. In this research, we concern with K-means clustering algorithm, which is one of the simplest unsupervised learning algorithms. We classify k dimensional vector (KDV) results into 5 groups, then carry out test by comparing clustering results with students' grades. Figure 3 shows how to make clusters from the data based on 5 grades.

Next, we consider to make clusters of students' comments collected at each lesson from 7th to 15th. 104 C comments are collected at the 7th lesson. The number of words extracted after analysing comments are 486 for the lesson.



Figure 3: An example of clustering data based on students' grades: S, A, B, C, and D.

The results in the training phase are shown in Table 7. Grade S accounts for about 54% in Cluster 1; grade A about 61% in Cluster 2; grade B about 43% in Cluster 3; grade C about 45% in Cluster 4; finally, grade D about 53% in Cluster 5. Here we call the grade that most frequently appears in a cluster, *dominant grade* in the cluster; dominant grades in Cluster 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 are S, A, B, C, and D, respectively.

Table 7: The results of training phase for lesson 7.

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Cluster 5
S	0.54	0.08	0.09	0.15	0
A	0.22	0.61	0.26	0.25	0.27
B	0.14	0.14	0.43	0.10	0.07
C	0.10	0.17	0.09	0.45	0.13
D	0	0	0.13	0.05	0.53

3.6 Noisy Data Detection

Outlier detection discovers data points that are significantly different from the rest of the data. In text mining, outlier analysis can be used to detect data that adversely affect the results (Mansur et al., 2005). In this paper, we detect outliers in two phases: training phase and test phase. We call such outliers noisy data from the points of view of grade prediction.

3.6.1 Noisy Data Detection in Training Phase

In the training phase, we calculate Standard deviation (*Sd*) to each cluster to detect noisy data.

The calculation of *Sd* is as follows:

1. For each cluster, say *i*th cluster, calculate the centroid c_i of the cluster by finding the average value of KDV formed comments in the cluster.

$$c_i = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n_i} s_{k,i}}{n_i} \quad (1)$$

Here $s_{k,i}$, and n_i are the *k*th singular vector representing a comment and the number of the comments in the *i*th cluster, respectively.

2. Calculate the standard deviation for the cluster.

The higher the Sd_i is, the lower the semantic coherence is (Dhillon et al., 2001). Here, we define noisy data of the *i*th cluster in training phase as follows:

$$Sd_i = \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{n_i} (s_{k,i} - c_i)^2 / n_i} \quad (2)$$

Noisy Data in the *i*th Cluster in Training Phase:
Let $s_{k,i}$ be the *k*th member of the *i*th cluster;

if $s_{k,i} > Sd_i$, then $s_{k,i}$ is a noisy data of the cluster, otherwise $s_{k,i}$ is not a noisy data of the cluster.

3.6.2 Noisy Data Detection in Test Phase

In the test phase, we calculate the average distance between a new comment and a cluster center to detect noisy data. We define noisy data of the *i*th cluster in test phase as follows:

Noisy Data in the *i*th Cluster in Test Phase:
Let c_i, $s_{k,i}$, and $d_{i,ave}$ be the center of the *i*th cluster, the *k*th member of the cluster, and the average distance between members of the cluster and c_i, respectively;

if $|s_{k,i} - c_i| > d_{i,ave}$, then $s_{k,i}$ is a noisy data for the cluster, otherwise $s_{k,i}$ is not a noisy data for the cluster.

3.6.3 Effect of Removing Noisy Data

Here we show the effect of noisy data detection in the training phase. Such the effect in test phase will be described in the next section.

Table 8 displays the result after detecting noisy data for lesson 7. They become better than before,

Table 8: The results of training phase after removing noisy data.

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Cluster 5
S	0.66	0.14	0.07	0.13	0
A	0.13	0.72	0.27	0.02	0.13
B	0.13	0	0.47	0.26	0.16
C	0.08	0.14	0.06	0.59	0.13
D	0	0	0.13	0	0.58



Figure 4: K-means cluster for training data at lesson 7 before detecting noisy data.



Figure 5: K-means cluster for training data after removing noisy data.

especially in cluster 1, 2, and 4. Figures 4 and 5 illustrate results before and after detecting noisy data in training phase, respectively.

4 PREDICTION PERFORMANCE

In order to predict a student's grade based on his/her comments, we established the following steps:

1. Extract words from a new comment.
2. Transform a comment to a set of k-dimensional vector (KDV) by calculating the following equation.

$$q' = q^T U_k S_k^{-1} \quad (3)$$

Here q and q' are the vector of words in a new comment multiplied by the appropriate word weights and the KDV transformed from q, respectively. The sum of these k dimensional word vectors is reflected by the term $q^T U_k$ in the above equation. The right multiplication by S_k^{-1} differentially weights the separate dimensions (Rosario, 2000).

3. Identify which cluster center is the nearest to the comment, by measuring the distance between the comment and cluster centers.
4. Return the dominant grade in the cluster to which the identified cluster center belongs, where the dominant grade in a cluster means the grade that most frequently appears in the cluster as described in the explanations of Table 7.

After performing the above steps, we conducted 10-fold cross validation. Table 9 and Figure 6 present the results of students' grade prediction: (Cluster1, S=53%), (Cluster 2, A= 54%), (Cluster 3, B=52%), (Cluster4, C=63%), (Cluster 5, D=47%).

Table 9: The results in test phase for lesson 7 before detecting noisy data.

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Cluster 5
S	0.53	0.19	0.10	0.05	0.06
A	0.11	0.54	0.14	0.09	0.18
B	0.21	0.11	0.52	0.14	0.18
C	0.10	0.08	0.10	0.63	0.11
D	005	0.08	0.14	0.09	0.47

In order to achieve higher similarity between data and improve our results, we apply noisy data detection algorithm in the test phase described in Section 3.5.2. The results are shown in Table 10 and Figure 7; the results become better than those shown in Figure 6. For example, grade S accounts for about 55%, and both grade C and D are removed in Cluster 1; grade A about 59% and grade D was removed in Cluster 2; grade B about 64% and grade D are removed in Cluster 3; grade C also about 64%, but grade S and B are removed in Cluster 4; grade D about 50%, and both grade S and C are removed in Cluster 5. We also show the results from lesson 8 to 15 in Figure 8, by applying the same method.



Figure 6: Students' grade prediction based on their comment data for lesson 7.

Table 10: The results in test phase after removing noisy data.

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Cluster 5
S	0.55	0.23	0.07	0	0
A	0.18	0.59	0.15	0.18	0.2
B	0.27	0.09	0.64	0	0.3
C	0	0.09	0.07	0.64	0
D	0	0	0.07	0.18	0.50



Figure 7: Student grade prediction for lesson 7 after removing noisy data.

Next, we calculated average prediction accuracy of students' grade from lesson 7 to 15 before and after detecting noisy data. The results are shown in Table 11 and Figure 9. The prediction accuracy results are between (59.3%) and (71.0%) for all data, and (63.5%) to (74.0%) after detecting noisy data. The highest accuracy results from the top were obtained in lessons 7 and 12, and the lowest ones from the bottom in lesson 8 and 14.

Table 11: The prediction accuracy results.

Lesson	All data	Noisy data Detection
7	71.0%	74.0%
8	59.3%	63.5%
9	70.0%	73.0%
10	67.3%	69.0%
11	65.5%	68.0%
12	71.0%	73.8%
13	68.3%	70%
14	64.0%	67.0%
15	64.5%	68.2%

This indicates that students wrote good comments in lesson 7. We think they had high motivation to write and express their attitudes to the lesson probably because they took the first lesson on programming at that time. The motivation might probably have become lower in lesson 8 due to difficulty of programming, but rose in lesson 9. In addition, the lessons 11, 14, and 15 have lower results. Finally, the last lesson became better than before. We believe from these views that we have to evaluate comments after each lesson to give feedback to students, and encourage them to write good comments. We believe that using these comments with useful way would improve students' performance.

5 CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we discussed the prediction method of students' grade based on C comments data from (Goda and Mine, 2011). The C comments present students' attitudes, understanding and difficulties concerning to each lesson. We applied LSA technique to the comments for obtaining approximate estimations of the contextual usage substitutability of words in larger text segments, and the kinds of meaning similarities among words and text segments. Then we classified the results into 5 groups by using K-means clustering method. To validate our proposed method, we conducted experiments to estimate students' academic performance based on their freestyle comments. The experimental results illustrate the validity of the proposed method.

This study expressed the correlation between self-evaluation descriptive sentence written by students and their academic performance by predicting their grade. In near future, we will develop another method to predict students' grades to get higher accuracy in prediction results. For this step, it is indispensable to devise a method for collecting good comments data that describe educational situations appropriately for each student, and for increasing the quality of the comments.

Collecting comments, however, is not an easy task for a teacher. We have to lead students so that they good describe comments. For example, we should prepare a comment form including items that we would like students to describe. One of the examples are PCNO we used. At this time, giving students' actual examples to write comments based on the objectives for each lesson is also a good option. In addition, we have to motivate students to describe their comments so that they wise up the worth-describing their comments; for example, let them improve their confidence and satisfaction to the lessons by looking back on their comments. Giving automated feedback will also help students



Figure 8: Analysing Comments Data from Lesson 8 to 15, (a) Training Data Results (B) Student's Grade Prediction.

increase their ability of descriptions. At this time, it is preferable that they can share their comments together in writing process.

Finally, further research is necessary to realize environments suitable for activating students' motivation and collect good comments.



Figure 9: Average prediction accuracy of students' grades from lesson 7 to 15.

We believe this will help a teacher give advice to students and improve their performance. In addition, it leads to an important step for improving performance of comment analysis and their learning status prediction.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported in part by *Project for Fostering Value-Creation Advanced ICT Frontier Human Resources by Fused Industry-University Cooperation* conducted by QITO, Kyushu University under the MEXT, Japan, and JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 24500176 and 25350311.

REFERENCES

Adhatrao, K., Gaykar, A., Dhawan, A., Jha, R., & Honrao,V., 2013. Predicting Students' using ID3 and C4.5 classification algorithms. *International Journal of Data Mining & Knowledge Management Process (IJDKP),* 3 (5), 39-52.

Antai, R., Fox, C., & Kruschwitz, U., 2011.The Use of Latent Semantic Indexing to Cluster Documents into Their Subject Areas. *In: Proceedings of the Fifth Language Technology Conference. Springer*. ASME Design Engineering Technical conferences, DETC2001/DTM-21713.

Bachtiar, A. F., Kamei, K., & Cooper, W. E., 2012. A Neural Network Model of Students' English Abilities Based on Their Affective Factors in Learning. *Journal of Advanced Computational Intelligence, and Intelligent Informatics,* 16 (3), 375-380.

Berry, W. M., Dumais, S., & O'Brien, G., 1995. Using linear algebra for intelligent information retrieval. *SIAM Review*, 37 (4), 573-595.

Bharadwaj, B. K., Pal, S., 2011a. Data Mining: A prediction for performance improvement using classification. *International journal of Computer Scien ce and Information security (IJCSIS)*, 9 (4), 136-140.

Bharadwaj, B. K., Pal. S., 2011b. Mining Educational Data to Analyze Students' Performance. International *Journal of Advance Computer Science and Applications (IJACSA)*, 2 (6), 63-69.

Botana, J., Leo, A., Olmos,R.,& Escudero,I., 2010. Latent Semantic Analysis parameters for Essay Evaluation using Small-Scale Corpora. *Journal of Quantitative Linguistics*, 17 (1), 1–29.

Csorba, K., Vajk, I., 2006. Double Clustering in Latent Semantic Indexing. *In proceedings of SIAM*, 4th Slovakan-Hungarian Joint Symposium on Applied Machine Intelligence, Herlany, Slovakia.

Dhillon, I. S., Modha, D. S., 2001. Concept De-compositions for Large Sparse Text Data Using Clustering. *Kluwer Academic Publishers,* 4(1–2), 143–175.

Dumais, S., 1991. Improving the retrieval of information from external sourse. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, and Computers*, 23, 229-236.

Goda, K., Hirokawa, S., & Mine, T., 2013. Correlation of Grade Prediction Performance and Validity of-Self-Evaluation Comments. *SIGITE'13,* Florida USA, 35-42.

Goda, K., Mine, T., 2011. Analysis of Students' Learning Activities through Quantifying Time-Series Comments. Proc. *KES 2011, Part II (LNAI 6882)*, 154–164.

Hill, A., Dong, A., & Agogino, A. M., 2002. Towards Computational Tools for Supporting the Reflective Team. Artificial intelligence in Design '02, Dordrecht, Netherlands: *Kluwer Academic Publishers*, 305–325.

Kabakchieva, D., (2013). Predicting Student Performance by Using Data Mining Methods for Classification. *Cybernetics and Information Technologies*, 13 (1), 61-72.

Kovacic, J. Z., Green, S. J., 2010. Predictive working tool for early identification of 'at risk' students, *Open Polytechnic,* New Zealand.

Landauer, T. K., Dumais, S. T., 1997. A solution to Plato's problem: The Latent Semantic Analysis theory of the acquisition, induction, and representation of knowledge. *Psychological Review*, 104, 211-240.

Landauer, T. K., McNamara, D., S., Dennis, S., & Kintsch, W., 2013. *Handbook of Latent Semantic Analysis, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates*, Psychology Press. New York, 2nd edition.

Mansur, M. O., Sap, M. & Noor, M., 2005. 'Outlier Detection Technique in Data Mining. A Research Perspective', *In Postgraduate Annual Research Seminar*.

Minami, T., & Ohura, Y. 2013. Lecture Data Analysis towards to Know How the Students' Attitudes Affect to their Evaluations. *8 International Conference on Information Technology and Applications (ICITA),* 164-169.

Osmanbegović, E., Suljić, M., 2012. Data Mining Approach for Predicting Student Performance. *Journal*

of Economics and Business, X (1) 3-12.

Rosario, B., 2000. Latent Semantic Indexing: An overview, INFOSYS *240, Spring* (final paper).

Salton, G., McGill, M. J., 1983. *Introduction to Modern Information Retrieval*, McGraw-Hill, New York.

Sembiring, M., Dedy, Z., Ramliana, S., & Wani, E., 2011. Prediction of student academic performance by an application of data mining techniques *International* Proceedings *of Economics Development and Research IPEDR, 6.*

Witter, D., Berry, M. W., 1998. Downloading the latent semantic indexing model for conceptual information retrieval. *The computer journal*, 41, 589-601.

Yadav, K., Bharadwaj, B. K., & Pal, S., 2011. Data Mining Applications: A comparative study for predicting students' performance. *International journal of Innovative Technology and Creative Engineering (IJITCE)*, 1(12).

Zaiane, O., 1999. *Principles of Knowledge Discovery in databases*, chapter 8. Data Clustering lecturing slides for CmPUT 690, University of Alberta.