CampusPulse Initiative - Task 1 Report

Machine Learning Coding Week 2025 – IIT Guwahati

Author: Ritesh Raj Singh Roll Number: 240101079

Level 1: Variable Identification Protocol

- Feature_1 → Age
 - Values ranged from 15 to 22
 - Histogram centered at 16–18, aligns with college age
 - o Correlated with failures (more failures, later entry age)
- Feature_2 → Study Time
 - Values ranged from 1 to 4
 - Positively correlated with G1, G2, G3
 - o Indicates more study time, better grades
- Feature_3 → Extrovertedness
 - Correlated with Dalc (alcohol) and goout, negatively with grades
 - Suggests a behavioral trait related to social activity

✓ Level 2: Data Integrity Audit

Columns with missing values:

- famsize: dropped rows
- Fedu: median imputation

- traveltime, higher, freetime, absences: filled with contextually logical defaults (e.g., 0)
- G2, age, studytime, extrovert: filled using median

All strategies were justified with context or distribution-based logic.

Ⅲ Level 3: Exploratory Insight Report

1. Absences vs Romantic Status

o Box plot showed higher absences among romantically involved students.

2. Family Relationship Quality

o Romantic students showed lower average family relationship scores.

3. Mother's Education vs Paid Classes

• Higher maternal education correlated with more paid class participation.

4. Address vs Alcohol Consumption

 Urban students had more low-alcohol consumption (rating = 1), rural students showed more variation.

5. Travel Time vs Final Grade (G3)

• Slight downward trend in grades with higher travel time.

in Level 4: Predictive Modeling

- Categorical variables were label encoded
- Split dataset into training and test (23% test)
- Models used:

- Logistic Regression
 - Accuracy: 67%
- Random Forest Classifier
 - Accuracy: 60%

Tried both full-feature and reduced-feature sets to optimize performance.

Level 5: Model Reasoning and SHAP

- SHAP Summary Plot used for feature importance.
 - o Most influential features: age, G2, absences
- SHAP Force Plots created for individual "Yes" and "No" predictions to explain model behavior.

Interpretation showed that age and academic performance were influential in predicting romantic relationships.

Conclusion:

This task emphasized a full ML pipeline—cleaning, exploring, modeling, and interpreting. The predictive model (logistic regression) reached a reasonable accuracy (~67%) and offered transparent explanations through SHAP visualizations.