A Multi-Dimensional Recommendation Framework for Learning Material by Naive Bayes Classifier
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Abstract—Personal Learning Environment (PLE) solutions can empower learners to design ICT environments for their activities in different learning contexts. Recommender systems have been used for supporting learners in PLE-based activities. Since, in the current recommendation approaches, multidimensional attributes of resource and dynamic interests and multi-preference of learners are not fully considered simultaneously, this paper proposes a novel resource recommendation framework in order to personalize learning environments. Learner Tree (LT) is introduced to take into account the multidimensional attributes of resources and learners’ rating matrix simultaneously. In addition, a forgetting function also is used to reflect dynamic preference of a learner and a Bayesian classifier is used to predict rate of unrated resources. The main contribution of this paper is proposing a multidimensional data model to consider multi-preference of learner and using naive Bayes classifier to improve the quality of recommendation in the terms of precision, recall and also intra-list similarity. In addition, the proposed approach tries to satisfy the learner’s real learning preference accurately according to the real-time up dated contextual information.
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I. INTRODUCTION

In PLEs, personalized recommendations help filtering information based on “soft” but significant context boundaries [1], giving learners the opportunity to take the best of an environment where shared content differed in quality, target audience, subject matter, and is constantly expanded, annotated, and repurposed [2].

In the recent years, several researches have addressed the need for personalization in the web-based learning environment. Addressing more learner-centric technology-enhanced learning (TEL) streams, recommendations seem to be a powerful tool for personal learning environment (PLE) solutions [3]. The task of delivering personalized learning resource is often framed in terms of a recommendation task in which a system recommends items to an active user [4]. Several educational recommender systems have been proposed in the literature that the most of them focus on recommending suitable resources or learning activities [5]. On the other hand, in PLEs, personalized recommendations help filtering information based on “soft” but significant context boundaries [1]. Locating the suitable learning resources has become a big challenge. One way to address this challenge is the use of recommender systems [6].
Recommender system is being deployed in more and more e-commerce entities to best articulate and accommodate customers’ interests. Recommender systems in learning environment need to satisfy other requirements than recommenders in e-commerce. It is necessary that the recommended items be fit into the current context of the user, considering e.g. her competences and learning goals to support her while recommendations in time when learners’ current interests are changing. Thus, it will lead to a great difference between recommended resources and learners' actual preferences. Therefore, it is necessary to implement an adaptive approach for producing recommendations.

To model adaptive multi-preference of learner, this paper proposes a new resource recommendation framework and relevant recommendation algorithm for learning environments. Therefore, the originality of this paper is that it can take into account the dynamic interests and multi-preference of learners and multidimensional attributes of resource simultaneously. This research can calculate relevant degree between learners and resources based on the target learners’ historical access records and multidimensional attributes of learning resources. In order to reflect learners’ complete spectrum of interests, a multidimensional data model as a Learner Tree (LT) is introduced to consider resources’ multi-dimensional attributes information, learners’ rating information for modeling of multi-preference of learner. Truly, LT is build based on target learners’ historical access records and multi-dimensional attributes of learning resources. Then, a new measure is introduced that can use LT and multi-dimensional attributes of a learning resource for calculating relevance degree between them. In addition, a Bayesian classifier is used to predict rate of unrated resources and a forgetting function also is used to reflect dynamic preference of a learner. The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Literature review section, the previous related works on learning resource recommender systems is discussed. Methodology section introduces the overall system framework and describes the proposed algorithm step by step. Implication section applies the proposed algorithm for a dataset to evaluate and analyze the performance and limitations of it. Finally,
Conclusion section provides the concluding remarks along with suggestions for future works.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Personal learning environments (PLEs) refer to a set of learning tools, services, and artifacts gathered from various contexts to be used by the learners Henri et al. [24]. PLE solutions should provide facilities for empowering learners in using this kind of technology. One possible solution is the application of recommender technology [25].

Recommendation in a TEL context has many particularities that are based on the richness of the pedagogical theories and models [26]. For instance, for learners with no prior knowledge in a specific domain, relevant pedagogical rules could be applied [27]. Different from commercial transaction, learners achieve different levels of competences that have various levels in different domains. Therefore, identifying the relevant learning goals and supporting learners in achieving them is very important. On the other hand, depending on the context, some particular user task may be prioritised. This could call for recommendations whose time span is longer than the one of product recommendations [28]. In addition, in the teacher-centered learning context, one of the most important tasks that needs to be supported is lesson preparation. Lesson preparation can include a variety of information seeking tasks, such as finding content to motivate the learners, to recall existing knowledge, to illustrate, visualize and represent new concepts and information [29]. User modeling and recommendation process of the recommendation strategies and some of related works were presented in the Table 1.

1) Data mining

These techniques usually model learners using the gathered information about the learner behavior, such as navigation history, to produce recommendations. These techniques usually are used for recommendation an effective learning path. Romero et al. [10] developed a specific web mining tool for discovering suitable rules in recommender engine. Their objective was recommendation to a student the most appropriate links/webpages to visit next. In these two researches, learners are modeled as sequences of visited resources and usually association rules are implemented for discovering suitable rules for recommendation. This strategy cannot model multidimensional attributes of learning resources for improving the accuracy of recommendation. Also this strategy usually doesn’t use rating matrix as suitable information for recommendation.

2) Content based filtering

This strategy extracts features of items and builds a matching model for them. User model includes preference information of learner about item’s features. Since this strategy cannot model similarity between learners for improving the quality of recommendation, only certain resources which are similar to learner’s historical preference can be recommended.

3) Collaborative filtering

Collaborative filtering systems that are also called clique-based systems assume that users who had similar choices before will make same selection in the future. Initial hints of relating collaborative filtering to education have appeared in early relevant papers [30]. Soonthornphisaj et al. [16] used Collaborative filtering for resource recommendation. First, the weight between all users and the target learner is calculated by Pearson correlation. Then, the n users with the highest similarity to the active learner are selected as the neighborhoods. Finally, using the weight combination obtained from the neighborhood, the rating prediction is calculated.

4) Hybrid approach

Most of researchers used hybrid approach for resource recommendation to address drawbacks of previous strategies. A proposed system that adopts a hybrid approach for recommending learning resources is the one recently proposed by Drachsler et al. [31].

Figure 1. Overall architecture of the proposed recommender system to personalize learning environment
The authors proposed a system that combines social-based with information-based recommendation techniques.

In addition, in the hybrid model based recommendation strategy, some of other techniques such as Case-Based Reasoning [32], intelligent agents [33], neural network [34], genetic algorithm [35] and ontology [36] are used. Usually these recommendations require intensive computation. An appropriate recommendation technique can be chosen according to pedagogical reasons. These pedagogical reasons are derived from specific demands of lifelong learning [37]. Therefore, some recommendation techniques are more suitable for specific demands of lifelong learning than others. One way to implement pedagogical decisions into a recommender system is to use a variety of recommendation techniques in a recommendation strategy. In this paper, in order to improve the learning resource recommendation efficiency, a framework for integrating contextual information including multi-dimensional attributes of resources, learner’s rating information and time-variant multi-preferences of the learner has developed. Most of researches only use some of this information in resource recommendation process, but our proposed framework can use this information simultaneously to model adaptive multi-preference of learner and improve quality of recommendation.

III. METHODOLOGY

As Figure 1 shows in the offline mode, the learner model and resource model are built. Resources are modeled according to content modeling approach that will be explained in the next section. For learner modeling, server usage logs of learners are collected in a certain period. Then, Learner Tree (LT) is built as a multidimensional data model for each learner. In addition in this phase, Naive Bayes (NB) classifier is used for prediction the rates of unrated learning resources and Graduation Forgetting Function (GFF) is implemented to model learners’ dynamic preferences. In the online phase, system can calculate relevance degree between the active learner and resources and make suitable recommendation.

A. Offline phase

Learner and learning material modeling are done in this phase.

1) Learning material modeling

We can consider some attributes for learning resource such as subject for example literature, mathematics and computer science. In addition, since ratings of learner’s accessed resources that have certain attributes indicate the importance of these attributes for the learner; it can be considered as base for weighting of attributes for the learner. Therefore, in order to consider learner’s preference accurately, the multidimensional attributes of learning resource should be considered in the calculation of relevant resources for the learner. It must be noted, this research introduces a multidimensional attribute-based framework for recommendation that involves attributes of resource in the recommendation process, but selection of appropriate attributes may vary in the different systems. System developer can use Learning Object Metadata (LOM) to select suitable attributes. Relevant attributes of learning resource including type of object; author; owner; terms of distribution; format; and pedagogical attributes, such as teaching or interaction style could be selected. In this research according to the simplicity and usefulness and also expert opinions in the education area, we select four attributes including: subject, secondary subject, education type (Bachelor Level (B.L.), Master Level (M.L.), PhD Level (PhD.L.)) and publisher of resource. The most important of attributes (properties) of a learning resource for interest modeling of learner are subject and secondary subject; therefore in this research we use a weighting approach that allocates more weight for subject and secondary subject and less weight for other attributes.

The resource attributes’ description model can be defined as a multidimensional attributes vector $M = (AK_1, AW_1), (AK_2, AW_2), ..., (AK_n, AW_n)$ where $AK_i$ denotes the $i$-th dimensional attribute’s name of resource, $AW_i$ denotes the relevant weight value $AW_i \geq AW_{i+1} \geq \ldots \geq AW_n$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{n} AW_i = 1$. Based on this...
description model, the attributes of a certain resource $M_j$ can be defined as $MA_j = \{AK_{j1}, AK_{j2}, ..., AK_{jm}\}$ where $AK_{j\beta}$ denotes the $\beta$-th dimension attribute’s keyword of $M_j$. For example:

$$M_r = \{\text{Math}, \text{Mathematic}, \text{0.4}, \{\text{Statistic}, \text{0.25}\}, \{\text{Master}, \text{0.2}\}, \{\text{Author}, \text{0.15}\}\}$$

The weight of each attribute is produced by system developer to indicate the importance of each attribute. It must be noted new resources can added to the repository in offline mode and a system developer must determine $MA_j$ for each resource, but the relevant weight values are similar to the other resource.

2) Learner modeling

For learner modeling, two types of information are used. (1) Rating is used for modeling of learner’s preferences (2) access order of material is used for modeling dynamic interests of learner. In the following of this section, at first, we explain how to use the information in the learner modeling, and then the learner’s model is built based on the two types of information.

In this research, learner $L_i$ is defined as a tree with a $(m+1)$-level in which $m$ indicates the number of attribute of resources. In this tree, the leaf node which represents an accessed resource of $L_i$ is defined as a two-tuple: $LT_{RF} = \{\text{MID, MR}\}$, where MID indicates accessed resource ID, MR indicates rating of $L_i$ to a certain resource. The non-leaf node can be defined as a two-tuple: $LT_{non-leaf} = \{KA, MR\}$, where $KA$ is the keyword of the level-$i$ attribute of resource. A four-dimension attributes description model based LT is considered in this research including: subject, secondary subject, education type and publisher that a sample is shown in Figure 2.

The MR of non-leaf node $k$ can be calculated as the mean of $MR$ value of all leaf nodes which belong to $k$’s sub-tree. Each accessed resource corresponds to a unique path from root to relevant leaf node, and the keywords of all nodes located in this path correspond to the relevant keywords of $M_j$’s attributes.

A new user must first register and get an ID, then system can build a $LT$ for him/her. It must be noted building and updating trees for different systems may be different, for a huge number of users, system developer must construct a system that updates $LT$s in offline, otherwise for getting better recommendation; system can update $LT$s in online. System can update $LT$ based on the following strategy:

Search the keywords of the latest accessed resource attributes ($MA_j = \{AK_{j1}, AK_{j2}, ..., AK_{jm}\}$ in $LT$ from the upper row to the bottom row. If the keyword of $i$-th attribute cannot be matched, the $m-i+1$ new level with latter $m-i+1$ attributes of resource will be created at a new rout and updated $MR$ in the whole of tree.

3) Rating prediction

Dependency of our approach on learner ratings can be a drawback. Because several learners must evaluate each learning resource and new resources cannot be recommended until some learners have taken the time to evaluate them. This problem referred to as ‘data sparsity’ and ‘cold start problem’. For solving this problem and improving the accuracy of recommendation, we used a predictor for rating prediction unrated resources. By a predictor such as the naive Bayes classifier, we can fill in the missing values of the rating matrix to form a pseudo rating matrix.

Naive Bayes algorithms have frequently adopted in recent works for information retrieval and recommender systems [38]. The algorithm’s popularity and performance for information retrieval and recommender systems applications have prompted researchers to empirically evaluate and compare different variations of naive Bayes that have appeared in the literature [25, 39]. In addition, the naive Bayes classifier is robust with respect to missing feature values, which may make it appropriate to the rating prediction. In this classifier, assuming the features are independent given the class, the probability of a certain class given all of the features can be computed, and then the class with the highest probability will be classified as the predicted class.

In this research, we independently learn one classifier for each learning resource $y$. We train the classifier for learning resource $y$ using all learners $u$ in the data set who has supplied a rating for learning resource $y$. The input vectors used to construct the classifier for resource $y$ consist of ratings for all resources other than resource $y$. We will refer to resource $y$ as the class resource, and the remaining resources as feature resources. We can express this naive Bayes classifier for resource $y$ in terms of a Bayesian network as seen in Figure 3 as the nodes represent random variables corresponding to the class label $M_y$, and the components of the input vector $M_1, M_2, ..., M_y, M_{y+1}, M_{y+2}, ..., M_n$.

To learn the naive Bayes rating predictor we must estimate $P(M_y = v)$, the prior probability that resource $y$ takes value $v$ in rating and $P(M_j = w|M_y = v)$, the probability that resource $j$ takes value $w$ in rating given the value of resource $y$ is $v$. These probabilities can be estimated using frequencies computed from the training data as seen in Equations 1 and 2.

$$P(M_y = v) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \phi(M_y^i, v)}{N}$$

Figure 3. Naive Bayes classifier for rating prediction.
By using above approach for rating prediction, we can make a pseudo rating matrix and improve the quality of recommendation.

### B. Online phase

The development of recommendation is done in this phase. It includes gathering the access history of learners and calculating relevance degree between learner and resources and finally selecting the Top-N recommended resources.

#### 1) Relevance degree calculation

The preference of a learner may change and the history records couldn’t entirely reflect the whole preference of a learner. To have a personal learning environment, inspired from Chuan-chang [40], Gradual Forgetting Function (GFF) concept is introduced in order to reflect dynamic interests and preference of learner’s more accurately.

The main idea of GFF is to introduce a forgetting function into calculation of the relevance degree between learner and resources. If the relevance degree between user \( L_i \) and \( M_j \) is \( RD(L_i,M_j) \), then the new relevance degree will be \( h(M_j) \times RD(L_i,M_j) \). In this research, we consider a nonlinear forgetting function as follows:

\[
h(M_j) = \exp(\lambda \times (M_j - 1)) \quad x \geq 1,
\]

Where \( x \) is the access order for \( M_j \) by learner \( L_i \). Therefore, the effect of \( M_j \) to \( L_i \)’s future interest will become smaller with resource access process going on, therefore, \( h(M_j) \) should be attenuated gradually. In \( h(M_j) \), \( \lambda \) is an adjustable parameter used to describe the change rate of user’s preference, and the bigger of it, the quicker of the forgetting.

To calculate relevance degree between learning resources and a learner, at first according to each dimensional attribute’s keyword, certain resource \( M_j \) is matched with each level’s \( k \) value of \( LT \) from top to down. The matching path of \( M_j \) and \( LT(L_i) \) denoted as \( MP(L_i,M_j) \) is the longest path, where keywords of all nodes of this path are identical to corresponding keywords of resource’s attributes. The relevance degree between resource \( M_j \) and learner \( L_i \) can be calculated by the following equation:

\[
RD(L_i,M_j) = h(M_j) \sum_{m \in MP(L_i,M_j)} MW_i \cdot MR_j
\]

It must be noted for unrated resource, \( h(M_j) \) value is mean of \( h(M_j) \) values of rated resources for each learner. \( MR \) is learner rating information in the \( s \)-th level’s matching; \( MW_i \) is the \( s \)-th level’s matching weight of \( LT \). since the \( MW_i \) should increase with depth growing, in this paper, it can be defined as \( MW_i = AW_i^{-s} \).

#### 2) Recommendation

When a learner registers and investigates the resource repository, by using resource accessed history of learner, the learner tree is constructed and evolved gradually. Then, when a learner requires resource recommendation, system calculates \( RD(L_i,M_j) \) based on Equation 5. Finally, the Top-N resources with largest \( RD(L_i,M_j) \) are regarded as the Top-N resource recommendation.

We know the aim of learning analytics is to determine the specific learning parameters for predicting some specific learning outcomes. In this research also we modeled some features of learning resource and learners as the specific learning parameters to predict interest of learner in a multidimensional space and dynamically.

### IV. EXPERIMENTS

In this section, a set of experiments have been conducted to set parameters and examine the effectiveness of our proposed recommender system in terms of recommendation accuracy and quality.

#### A. Experiment environment

In the existing state-of-the-art, recommender systems use one of the following approaches to evaluate the performance of their systems: a real environment, an evaluation environment, the logs of the system or a user simulator. By an evaluation environment, we let a set of users to interact with the system over a period of time. In this approach, usually, the results are not reliable enough because the users often know the purpose of the evaluation. The analysis of the logs files of real users obtained in a real or evaluation environment is also a common technique for evaluation of recommender systems. In this condition, the cross-validation technique is often used for evaluation of recommender system. A few systems use simulated users to evaluate their performance. This approach can enable large-scale experiments to be implemented quickly and also makes that experiments are repeatable and perfectly controlled. However, the
main drawback of this system is that it can’t simulate the real behavior of a user. Users are too complicated to predict and also their feelings and their emotions, and therefore, their actions change dynamically. Results obtained in a real environment with real users are the best way to evaluate a recommender system. But the main problem of the real and the evaluation environments is that repetition of the experiments. Therefore, in this research we use log files of real environment that enables us to repeat the experiments and implement the cross-validation technique.

In this research, a real-world dataset, learning records are applied in our experiments. The learning records dataset comes from the usage data of the course management system Moodle. MOODLE (Modular Object-Oriented Dynamic Learning Environment) is defined as a course management system (CMS), a free, Open Source software package designed using pedagogical principles, to help educators by creating effective online learning communities. Moodle stores detailed records of students’ activities and the educator can access summarized reports about these activities according to the categories specified by the Moodle system.

The used dataset contains 59581 lending records from 1723 users on 32345 books where each record contains timestamp and rating information (as the ratio of certain lending time segment to maximum lending time segment), in addition it contains books’ type information and users’ basic information. The characteristics of this dataset are summarized in Table 2. In order to increase the number of records in test set as much as possible so as to eliminate the effect of accidental factor, the top 60% access records of each user in order dataset are used as training set and the remnant 40% access records are used as test set.

Moodle has a number of interactive learning activity modules such as forums, chats, quizzes and assignment. In addition, by Moodle we can register and track user’s accesses (user identification, IP and time) and the activities and resources that have been accessed by user. Therefore each record includes (1) IP address, (2) Date and hour of the access, (3) Complete name of the user who has been accessed, (4) Type of access (resource view, course view, etc.), (5) Specific element of the course that has been visited. According these features, this dataset is suitable for evaluation of proposed approach.

### B. Performance metrics

Precision and Recall are popular, well-established metrics from the information retrieval community. Since the test data set or relevance set is the real tracking of users in the learning environment, truly by using this approach for recommendation, we want to predict the real behaviors of users in the learning environment. Despite of this approach takes into account the dynamic behavior of users for acquiring better recommendations, it is a prediction problem again, and thus Recall and Precision measures are valid for this type of dynamic data also.

The precision and recall are most popular metrics for evaluating information retrieval system. For the evaluation of recommender system, they have been used by various researchers. When referring to Recommender Systems the recall can be defined as follows:

\[
Recall = \frac{|\text{test} \cap \text{top} - N|}{|\text{test}|} \tag{6}
\]

Where \(\text{top} - N\) denotes the recommendation set and \(\text{test}\) denotes the test set. The precision when referring to recommender systems can be defined as follows:

\[
Precision = \frac{|\text{test} \cap \text{top} - N|}{N} \tag{7}
\]

Where \(N\) denotes number of recommendation.

Since usually there is a trade-off between algorithm running time and recommendation precision, we measure mean running time for single user that can help us for an appropriate decision.

Users interact with recommendation list and accuracy metrics cannot see this problem because they are designed to judge the accuracy of individual item predictions; they do not judge the contents of entire recommendation lists. Since the recommendation list should be judged for its usefulness as a complete entity, not just as a collection of individual items, in this research we also define an Intra-List Similarity Metric [41] as follows:

\[
ISM(\text{List}) = \frac{\sum_{i \neq j} \sum_{k \neq i} f(M_i, M_j)}{|\text{List}| \choose 2} \tag{8}
\]

Where

\[
f(M_i, M_j) = \frac{\text{mat}(M_i, M_j)}{m} \tag{9}
\]

Where \(\text{mat}\) indicates number of matching attributes between resource \(M_i\) and \(M_j\). As it was said before \(m\) is number of considered attributes for resource. Higher similarity denotes lower diversity.

### C. Parameter setting

Firstly, we will analyze how \(\lambda\) affects the recommendation performance in order to determine the values of this parameter (as different dataset may correspond to different optimal value of this parameters, this analysis process is just based on records dataset). Figure 4 shows the impacts of \(\lambda\) on the precision of the proposed approach while \(N=30, p=300, K = 30\). It indicates that the best precision can be obtained with \(\lambda = 0.3\).
D. Performance evaluation

In this section, the architecture proposed and corresponding recommendation mechanism is compared with traditional recommendation algorithms including vector space model-based content-based recommendation algorithm [42], user and item combined collaborative-based recommendation algorithm [43] and hybrid recommendation algorithm [44]. In relevant input parameters, \( N \) denotes the number of recommendation resources and \( p \) denotes the number of participated users which are selected from dataset to build experiment dataset. Since the main objective of this research is to recommend the suitable resource for learners, in the following of this section we conduct some of experiment to compare result of recommendation for the proposed method for different situation. Therefore, the precision, recall and mean absolute error of proposed method are compared with the three traditional algorithm based on the number of participated users, \( p \) and number of recommendation resources, \( N \).

The precision of algorithms with respect of \( p \): In the first experiment, the precision of recommendation algorithm is compared with respect to \( p \) that denotes the number of participated users which are selected from records dataset to build experiment dataset while \( N=30 \). As shown in Figure 5, with increasing of \( p \), the precision of algorithms is increasing except content based algorithm, where the proposed recommendation algorithm always produces better performance than any other algorithms. When \( p \) is small, as users’ information cannot be utilized efficiently, the collaborative based algorithm cannot detect effective similar users and will lead to bad result. With \( p \) increasing, by utilizing much more users’ information efficiently, the performance of collaborative based algorithm will be enhanced gradually. However, improved hybrid recommendation algorithm as combination of content-based and collaborative-based recommendation algorithm is somewhat better than either content-based or collaborative based algorithm alone. also, the proposed recommendation algorithm that can take into account the time-related dynamic preference, multi-dimensional attributes of resources and users’ rating information synthetically, the better results can be obtained whenever the number of \( p \) is small or large.

The Mean Running Times for single learner of algorithms with respect of \( p \): In the third comparison experiment, the mean running times for single learner of all algorithms is compared with respect to \( p \) while \( N=30 \). As shown in Figure 7 at all times, content-based algorithm is faster than any other algorithms. The running time of the proposed and improved hybrid recommendation algorithms are slightly larger than collaborative based algorithm. According these experiments, although the proposed recommendation will get higher precision in most case, it will cost the largest running time. Therefore, there is a trade-off between algorithm running time and recommendation precision when choosing the proposed recommendation algorithm.

The Recall of algorithms with respect of \( p \): In the fourth comparison experiment, the recall of recommendation algorithms is compared with respect to \( p \) while \( N=30 \). As shown in Figure 8, when \( p \) is low, the recall of all algorithms is approximately
equal, but by increasing of \( p \), the proposed recommendation has better results. Since learner modeling is based on attributes of accessed learning resources, proposed approach can find more relevant resource for learner and therefore get better result for recall measure. According these experiments, the proposed algorithm recommendation has higher precision and recall in most case.

![Figure 7. The Mean Running Times for single learner of algorithms with respect of \( p \)](image)

![Figure 8. The Recall of algorithms with respect of \( p \)](image)

**The ISM of algorithms with respect of \( N \):** In the sixth comparison experiment, the ISM of recommendation algorithms is compared with respect to \( N \) while \( p=300 \). As shown in Figure 9, at all time, the proposed algorithm have lower ISM than any other algorithms that means higher diversity. Because our proposed approach uses attributes of learning resource in recommendation process. By increasing number of recommendations, diversity decreases for all algorithms. As Figure 9 indicates content-based filtering has the lowest diversity and diversity in collaborative and hybrid recommendation is approximately equal.

![Figure 9. The ISM of algorithms with respect of \( N \)](image)

**V. CONCLUSION**

Over the recent years, recommender systems have been successfully deployed in various areas online retailing and social networking. Due to the success of this kind of technology, research on TEL has started to deal with recommender strategies for learning. However, as the repository of learning resources is very massive and learners’ preference changes dynamically, there are several drawbacks when applying the existing recommendation algorithms. To address these drawbacks, in this paper, we propose an effective e-learning recommendation framework by modeling adaptive multi-preferences of learner. In the proposed algorithm, in order to improve recommendation accuracy, Learning Tree was introduced that consider multi-dimensional attributes of resources, and relevant rating information simultaneously. The experiment results show that our algorithm can outperform traditional recommendation algorithms significantly and could be more suitable for personal learning environments. Based on the proposed algorithm, the learner’s real learning preference can be satisfied accurately according to the real-time up dated contextual information. The main contribution of this paper is proposing a multidimensional data model and using naive Bayes classifier to improve the quality of recommendation in the terms of precision, recall and also intra-list similarity.

For future researches, we can plan to continue our work on multidimensional collaborative filtering and multidimensional hybrid recommender system to further improve the recommendation performance. However, in personal learning environments, there is a temporal-dependency relationship in the learning processes (resource access processes), that can reflect learner’s latent resource access pattern and preference. Thus, by mining the learners’ historical access records, it can be recommended the most probable resource which will be accessed in near future by the learner for improving the performance of resource recommendation and solving new user problem.
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