

PREDICTIVE MODELING: WALLACE COMMUNICATIONS CAMPAIGN

Tree-Based and Neural Network Classifiers for Contract Prediction

STUDENT NUMBER: 3533826

1. PROJECT METHODOLOGY

Steps and Data Split Strategy (Req. 2)

- The project followed a supervised learning workflow.
- Data Preprocessing:** Cleansing (string normalization, ID removal), Imputation (Numeric: Median, Categorical: 'missing').
  - Feature Encoding:** Low-Card ( $\leq 20$  unique values) features used OHE. High-Card features used **Frequency Encoding**.
  - Data Split: Stratified** 80% Train / 20% Test split to preserve class imbalance ratios.
  - Tuning/Validation:** Hyperparameter search utilized **3-fold Stratified Cross-Validation** on the Training set.
  - Evaluation:** Final models were assessed on the independent Test set.

2. VARIABLES & HYPERPARAMETER APPROACH

Feature Treatment (Req. 3)

| Variable                   | Type                     | Treatment           |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|
| new_contract_this_campaign | Binary Target (1/0)      | N/A                 |
| age, duration              | Numeric (Cont.)          | Scaled, Median Imp. |
| job, marital, contact      | Cat. ( $\leq 20$ unique) | OHE, Constant Imp.  |
| poutcome                   |                          |                     |
| month, day (Example)       | Cat. ( $> 20$ unique)    | Frequency Encoded   |

**Consequence of Choice:** Using Frequency Encoding for high-cardinality features greatly **reduces dimensionality** (benefiting MLP) but risks **feature collision** where unrelated categories share the same frequency value.

Tuning Summary (Req. 4)

**Method: Randomized Search CV** ( $n\_iter = 2, K = 3$ , **Metric: ROC AUC**) **Comment:** Computationally efficient but **sub-optimal**. The low iteration count sacrifices best possible performance for speed (Elapsed time: 785s).

3. MODEL INSIGHTS & REFERENCES

Insights Gained (Req. 6)

- Imbalance Impact:** High Accuracy ( $\sim 91\%$ ) is misleading; low Recall (0.6566) on the minority class confirms the need for ROC AUC as the primary metric.
- Tree Superiority:** Ensemble tree models (RF, XGB, LGBM) drastically outperformed MLP, suggesting the predictive relationship relies on non-linear feature interactions and splits.

References (Req. 7)

- Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., & Friedman, J. (2009). *Statistical Learning*. (Ensemble Justification).
- Brownlee, J. (2020). *Frequency Encoding*. (Feature Encoding Justification).
- Jeni, L. A., & Cohn, J. F. (2016). *Class Imbalance*. (Metric Choice Justification).

4. FINAL MODEL AND RESULTS

Model Justification (Req. 5)

Selected Model: Tuned Random Forest

Chosen due to the highest discriminative power (ROC AUC of **0.9365**), demonstrating superior class separation across all tested models.

Key Performance Summary (Test Set)

| Metric              | Score         |
|---------------------|---------------|
| ROC AUC             | <b>0.9365</b> |
| Accuracy            | 0.9110        |
| Precision (Class 1) | 0.8541        |
| Recall (Class 1)    | 0.6566        |

Confusion Matrix

| Actual \ Predicted | 0 (No Contract)  | 1 (Contract)     |
|--------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 0 (No Contract)    | <b>7929</b> (TN) | 224 (FP)         |
| 1 (Contract)       | 680 (FN)         | <b>1300</b> (TP) |

**Commentary on Usefulness:** Highly effective at identifying true non-converters (High TN rate), resulting in **efficient sales targeting** (avoiding wasted calls). However, the **680** False Negatives represent 34% of valuable positive leads missed.

5. DATA SUMMARY & IMBALANCE

Dataset Profile

- Total Customers:** 50,662
- Test Set Size:** 10,133 (20%)
- Primary Predictive Feature:** duration (Highly correlated with success).

Class Imbalance Ratio

| Class           | Count (Test) | Ratio  |
|-----------------|--------------|--------|
| 0 (No Contract) | 8,153        | 80.46% |
| 1 (Contract)    | 1,980        | 19.54% |

**Conclusion:** Significant  $\approx$  **4:1 Imbalance**, justifying the use of stratified sampling and AUC-based evaluation metrics.

6. BEST MODEL PARAMETERS

Tuned Random Forest Configuration

The optimal hyperparameters found via Randomized Search ( $n\_iter=2$ ) were:

- Estimators** ( $n\_estimators$ ): 200
- Max Depth** ( $max\_depth$ ): None (Allows full tree growth)
- Min Samples Split** ( $min\_samples\_split$ ): 2
- Oversampling (SMOTE):** Disabled ( $use\_smote = False$ )
- Criterion:** Gini (Default)

**Note:** The preference for deeper trees ( $max\_depth=None$ ) is typical for Random Forest when aiming for low bias, potentially leading to overfitting if not checked by cross-validation.

7. BUSINESS RECOMMENDATIONS & FUTURE WORK

Recommendations

- Threshold Adjustment:** Lower the classification threshold for the Random Forest model to increase Recall (TP rate) on the minority class, reducing missed contract opportunities (FN).
- Focus on Precision:** Utilize the current model's high precision (0.8541) to create a highly curated "High Confidence" list for expensive, high-touch marketing channels, maximizing ROI.

Future Work

- Leakage Mitigation:** Investigate and potentially remove the duration feature, which often leaks target information, and re-train the model to assess true feature importance.
- Data Balancing:** Re-run the entire pipeline with SMOTE ( $use\_smote = True$ ) to directly address the 4:1 class imbalance and attempt to improve the poor Recall for the positive class.