Implementation of Stable Marriage Algorithm in Student Project Allocation

4

1

5 Abstract

Project allocation is an annual challenge for lecturers and students. The process of allocating
project involves matching preferences of student over project and with of staff over the
student, and is thus an instance of stable marriage problem from theoretical computer science
aspect. The aim is to find a stable allocation of project to students, such that it is impossible
to find a project swap that would make all involved parties (both students, both staff) happier.
This paper investigated efficacy of stable marriage algorithm and deployed basic Gale

12 Sharply algorithm into the process of allocating student project. A system was developed

using ruby and MySQL to handle the task. The result showed that the algorithm was able to
 improve the process by enhancing the stability involved.

15 Keywords: stable marriage, preferences, allocation, algorithm and project.

16 1. Introduction

The allocation of final year student a project is continuous process that attracts a lot of 17 attention at the end of every academic session. The task involves assigning each student a 18 project topic for their research work as part of the requirement of their programme. The 19 projects are proposed either by the student or the lecturer, after which both parties negotiate 20 21 on the scope of the project. This paper is about deploying basic Gale Sharply stable marriage algorithm in the process of allocating student project. Where each supervisor and student will 22 23 develop preference list from which project are allocated automatically when the algorithm is 24 run.

25 **1.2 Statement of the research problem**

26 At present, most institution does not have complete resources for managing process of final

27 year student project allocation. The current manual system of allocating project to student by

the project coordinators tend to be inefficient as the student can be allocated to supervisor

that they do not prefer. Equally, supervisor might not be able to select student that they can

30 work with effectively. Thus in this approach, students or supervisors proposed a project

31 whilst project coordinator handles the allocation process. It is most likely that a student might

32 be allocated to a topic or a supervisor in an area that he/she is not interested in. Similarly,

33 supervisor's proposed topic might be allocated to student who is not capable of undertaking

34 it, thus posing a great challenge in the process.

35 **1.3 Brief Overview of Basic Gale Shapley Stable Marriage Algorithm**

Matching between two set of elements is a natural phenomenon that is of significant interest to researchers. The most aspect of human nature involves pairing between two set such as Comment [DSA1]: Most institutions do not have

man to women, doctors to a hospital, student to a project and so on. And thus, this matching

39 needs to be smooth and stable. The concept of stable marriage was initially studied in (1962)

40 by Gale and Shapley (Gonczarowski et al., 2018). The aim was to solve the problem of

matching between equal number of men and women (Teo, Sethuraman and Tan, 2001). The 41 42 stable marriage problem deals with finding a stable pairing between two equally sized sets of groups, from preference order for each element in the group (Sanfoundry, 2013). The Gale-43 Shapley algorithm requires each element from one set in the matching to provide a complete 44 set of preference ordered list of other opposite set in the matching. In Gale-Shapley 45 algorithm, no incomplete preference is accepted. Which means both the two set most, be of 46 the same size and are ranked to each other (Iwama and Miyazaki, 2008). Generally, it can be 47 argued that stability is the key aspect that determine the success of each matching, and 48 according to Gale and Shapley (Gale and Shapley, 1962) there always exist at least one stable 49

50 matching in an instance of the stable marriage algorithm (Lightfoot, 2016).

Sanfoundry (2013) argued that the Gale Shapley algorithm could be implementedprogrammatically as shown in the figure below:

```
function stableMatching {
    Initialize all m ∈ M and w ∈ W to free
    while ∃ free man m who still has a woman w to propose to {
        w = m's highest ranked such woman to whom he has not yet proposed
        if w is free
            (m, w) become engaged
        else some pair (m', w) already exists
        if w prefers m to m'
            (m, w) become engaged
            m' becomes free
        else
            (m', w) remain engaged
    }
}
```

53 54

A Pseudocode of Gale Shapley algorithms (Sanfoundry, 2013).

55 1.4 Stable marriage problem and student project allocation

Generally, the criteria for allocating projects to students are much similar to the stable 56 marriage pairing. Matching different entities from two set of elements to each other usually 57 invoke the need for stability since individual's shows preferences over one another. 58 Allocating fixed number of student to a fixed number of the project has much in common to 59 the coupling of n men and n women, in terms of the problems that may evolve. To this vein, 60 it is apparent that deploying stable marriage problem and some of its solutions will have a 61 great impact on the process of allocating student a project. During the process of allocating 62 project the main aim for both student and staff is to have a happier working partner, it is 63 argued that the basic Gale and Shapley algorithm terminate with stable set of engaged couple 64 in which each pair is happy with each other and no any possibility for any swap that will 65 result to happier couple than initially formed (W. Irving and Gusfield, 1989). 66

Comment [DSA2]: Who authored the study in 1962? The same authors?

Comment [DSA3]: Remove

67 The convention in the process of allocating student project was, student always making a

request to the supervisors project and supervisor response to the request with an offer. This is

exactly in line to the idea of basic Gale-Shapley algorithm which involves sequential proposal from men part to the women (Gale and Shapley, 1962). However, some extension of

Gale-Shapley algorithm has the view that a woman can make a request to man and can accept

two or more men with the same rank (Tetsuo, Toshinori and Michio, 1999). Never the less, it

can be said that stable marriage problem and its solutions, is still feasible to project allocation

74 problem.

75 Moreover, allowing individual's (both student and staff) to create preferences, in the process

76 of the allocating project, is vital for the performance of the student during the research. Stable

77 marriage problem is strictly based on order list of preferences for the two parties involved. It

is argued that matching is always stable between two set if it's resulted from their preferences

79 to each other (F. Manlove and O'Malley, 2008).

80 So, therefore, it is said that stable marriage problem have much in common to the process of

allocating project and the algorithm will provide the best solution to this process. Finally, it can be evident that Basic Gale-Shapley algorithm is applicable to the process of allocating

83 project

84 2. Methodology

The method adopted in this paper was to design an allocation algorithm based on the criteria and the requirement of Gale Sharply algorithm. We start with creating student and supervisor's preferences then design the algorithm. The final system was developed using ruby programming language and MySQL as the database and local server for implementation.

90 3. System design

91 **3.1 Student preferences design**

This involves allowing the student to enter their preferences to projects they are interested. To achieve this goal, it is also necessary to consider the requirement of the stable marriage algorithm that was deployed in the design of this system. The algorithm requires that each student in the system should rank each project available in a strictly ordered way (Wan-Hong, 2017). This implies a student preferences list is required to include all available project ranked in a decreasing order of importance. So that, first project in their list is preferable than the subsequent one in that order (El-Atta and Moussa, 2009).

99 **3.2 Supervisor preferences design**

From reviewed existing system, it is understood that, during the period of project allocation, the project coordinator or admin allocate a number of the project to be proposed and supervised by each staff. Supervisors also show interest and need to create a preference of the student requesting to take their project. This resulted in staff making preference list of student willing to offer their project. The design of supervisor's preferences list also **fulfils** the requirement of stable marriage algorithm, as the second entity in the matching. The algorithm requires that all the other entities (students) must be ranked by each supervisor (project).



108 109

Fig.1 student and supervisors (project) preferences

110 **3.3 Student-project allocation algorithm**

The student project allocation algorithm was designed based on the basic Gale-Shapley stable marriage algorithm and some other related stable marriage problems derived from the review of other extensions of the Gale-Shapley algorithm. Some of the extension from the basic algorithm requires that no complete ranking of both partners is needed (Fleiner, 2014).

115 The final system was developed with little extension of the basic Gale algorithm. The system is

implemented such that it automate the ranking process when the number of involved parties grow larger. When the student rank some number out of the large number of project or supervisor rank

some students out of the list, the system upon the execution of the algorithm automate the ranking

119 and add to each user preference.

120 Pseudocode for student-project allocation algorithm

```
121
     Begin:
122
     Initialization:
123
          Each student=nil project
          Each project= nil student
124
125
          While some student S is unmatched from student list
                                               projects)
                (Students making request to
126
               P= 1<sup>st</sup> project in S preference list not requested
127
                S = P for each s and p (s and p could be set of
128
                students and projects respectively)
129
```







Fig.2 Flowchart for student-project allocation algorithm

145 Flowchart for student-project matching algorithm

146 A flowchart represents pictorially the step by step follow in the execution of an algorithm

147 (Aler, 2010). Figure 5 shows the steps of execution of student project algorithm, the

148 flowchart start by initializing both student and project to be unpaired. The next step involves

- 149 pairing. For a pairing to be successful and added to the matching set, it must satisfy the
- 150 condition which checks no single project allocated to two students. If the condition failed, the
- 151 pair is added to the unmatched set. Then unmatched student makes a new request from the
- unassigned project. If the request is accepted the set are paired and added to the matching set.
- 153 The cycle continues until all pairing is stable and one-to-one before the algorithm terminate.

Comment [DSA4]: Which Figure 5 are you referring to?

154 **3.4 Input for student project allocation algorithm**

The students in the system individually create their preferences, from the available project of
their interest. Similarly, the staff creates their rank preferences from the student in the system.
Student allocation algorithm requires those overall preferences as input, in a certain
constraint order. This requires n number of students and n number projects to be ranked to
each other.

160 The developed system consists of three (3) dashboard: the student, project supervisor and 161 administrator. The student login into the system to submit project topic, create ranking 162 preferences, and to receive update about the allocation. The supervisor login to submit a 163 propose topic and also create preference of the student. The administrator manage the 164 allocation process as well as run the allocation algorithm.

- ject Allocation Dashboard Pro Q Dashboard administrator III View Administrator Checklist Allocation Algorithm Run the algorithm - Anage Project View All The Ranking Pre Number of Pro int Engageme Projects per Student Project Allocation Available Projects per Unatiocated Stude 1.2 © 2015 The University of Sheffeld. C Get Hel Show all Project Allo 166
- 165 The final system was implemented and the admin dashboard is shown below:

167

Fig.3 admin dashboard of the implemented system

168 **4. Result**

To test the feasibility of the algorithm in the allocation process, a system is being developed for the allocation with the algorithm implemented in it. The system provide an interface for the student to enter their preferences to the available projects and supervisor (project) to the available students. The algorithm take as input the two preference list and allocate each student to his/her most appropriate project from the perspective of both ranking. The system is tested with the data and result below:

- 175 Example:
- 176 Sample students (University username)
- 177 Acp14jlr, acp14sh, acp14msa, acp14xw, and acp14hat
- 178 Sample project topics

- 179 Listening to Sheffield (LTS), decision support system (DSS), student placement portal (SPP),
- 180 privacy of information (PI), and project allocation system (PAS).

181 Ranking Preferences

- 182 Each student rank the available project from highest to the lowest left to right. Likewise, the
- supervisor (project) rank the students from highest to the lowest in same order in the table
- 184 below:
- 185 Table 1: students and supervisors ranking preferences.

Student preferences	Supervisor (project) preferences
Acp14sh =>DSS, SPP, PI, LTS, PAS	PAS=>acp14jlr, acp14hat, acp14sh,
Acp14msa=>SPP, PAS, LTS, PI, DSS	acp14msa, acp14xw
Acp14xw=> PI, SPP, PAS, DSS, LTS	DSS=>acp14msa, acp14sh, acp14hat,
Acp14hat=> PI, PAS, LTS, SPP, DSS	acp14jlr, acp14xw
	PI=>acp14msa, acp14xw, acp14hat,
	acp14sh, acp14jlr
	LTS=>acp14xw, acp14msa, acp14jlr,
	acp14sh, acp14hat

186

189 190

- 187 This page shows the sample ranking from the implemented system. The student created a
- 188 rank preferences of the available project.

("acp14)#"=="Listening to Sheffield")	1	Delete
("acp14/#"=>"litudeni Placement portal")	1	Delete
("acp14@"=="Project Allocation System")	4	Detete
("Decision Support System"++*acp14(#")	1	Delete
["Decision Support System"~>"acp14xw"]	4.	Delete
("Student Placement portal">>/acp14sh")	4	Delete
("acp14/it"<>"Privacy of Information")	2	Detete
ick to Datatooud		

191 The case where the number of student or the project grow large, and the student or the 192 supervisor could not rank all the other partner. The system implement a function which 193 automate the ranking of unranked partner.

194 The result after running the system with the above data is shown below:

Project Allocation	Dashboard Projects Administratio	00* ¹⁰	Find a project Q	Salisu Modi (Admin		
	Iviatoning					
	This are the preferences for each student and the Project					
	(acoti):first; Sucket Placement portal; Syster; Sucket Naccement portal; Syster; Under Naccement portal; Napater; Underling to Shifted; Tritag National System; Nachen Placement to Napatiens; Applicat; Herdinian Store Saphifers; Acoti(Jr); Underling to Shift The Result of Matching	Listering to Sheffield . "Froject Allocation System", Decision C vary of Information", Listening to Sheffield ", Inspirat, Albadian of Information", Decision Support System", Jacof Mark **, "Pre- Sheffield", and Mark **, Prevary of Information", Preven Mar- ini, Sheffield and Sheffield ", Sheffield", Preven Mark Higher M angel Mark **, Sheffield **, Sheffield **, Sheffield Higher M angel Mark **, Sheffield **, Sheffield **, Sheffield Higher M angel Mark **, Sheffield **, Sh	Support System", "Privacy of Information", "Incel fails "of Decision Support System", "Incel America", "Studen Theorement sortal", "Project Allocation and Information Toulour Theorem to a condit, "Tole Allocation System", et on System ", Electricity Student Reservoir portal ", Toronen ", "Project Allocation System" a franchijf", Student Reservoir portal ", Toronen ", Project Allocation System" a franchijf", Student Reservoir portal ", Toronen ", Project Allocation System" a franchijf", Student Reservoir portal ", Toronen ", Project Allocation System" a franchijf", Student Reservoir portal ", Toronen ", Project Allocation System", a franchijf", angel Allocation System", angel Allocation System and Allocation (System), angel Allocation System (E			
	Project Title	Student University Usemame	Student Emeil			
	Listening to Sheffleid	acp14)r	Send Emel			
	Decision Support System	urq1 14 41	Sand Final			
	Staded Placencel pullat	aq <mark>r14</mark> arsı	Stand Honait			
	Privacy of Information	acp14xw	Send Email			
	Project Allocation System	acp 14hat	Send Emell			
	This matching is stable					
	Back to Dashboard		Northy Students by Email			
	100 E 10					



Fig. 5 sample test result from implemented system

From the above result of matching, student acp14jlr was allocated to LTS project which happened to be his/her second choice. The student cannot get his /her first choice because the student was rank fourth by the supervisor of the project. And LTS supervisor cannot get his/her first choice student (acp14xw) because was ranked the last by the student. In thus order, the algorithm makes all the remaining allocation.

At the end of matching the student to project from the preferences from both sets, a set containing each student with allocated partner was returned. It was argued that matching entities from two set of the element with preferences from both set always resulted to individuals in the set been paired with one another (F. Manlove and O'Malley, 2008).

The result of running student project allocation algorithm, student and project instances are returned. Those instances have a number of properties which include allocated partners. Each student has a partner (project) assigned to him/her. This project was at least the first or at most the last project from the preference list of the student, depending on the rank position the student was in the preferences order of the project.

From the result of running the algorithm as applied to some number of student and project, it can be concluded that, no swap between any pair will result to happier matching than the initial one since all pairing resulted from the preferences that the student or the project created and accepted before the pairing (Aderanti et all, 2016). The final result of student project allocation algorithm returns a matching set with each student in the system allocated to one project.

217

218

Comment [DSA5]: See comment above

Comment [DSA6]: et al.

220 **5. Performance of the algorithm**

The strength this algorithm is in its ability to provide stability in matching n equal number of involved parties (Moussa and Abu El-Atta, 2011). Csaba (2018) argued that in any matching that is two-sided and both the involved parties need to rank each other, then the solution that handled the matching, the stability is the main requirement for such solution. The Gale Shapley algorithm all ways result to a matching set when two parties are matched from result to a matching set when two parties are matched from their preferences (Deng, Panigrahi and Waggoner, 2017)

228 **6. Time complexity and correctness of the algorithm**

229 The whole idea in Gale Shapley algorithm is matching n number of one party with n number 230 of other party (where n is any counting number). In this implementation, n number of student 231 is matched with n number of project from their preferences. The process involved iterating through all free students while there is still unallocated student. Each free student goes to all 232 233 project topic in his preference list in an orderly manner. And for each supervisor (project) student goes to, he checks if the project is unallocated, if yes the allocation (student-project) 234 is performed. If the project is allocated to someone else, then the project (supervisor) chooses 235 either to remain allocated (reject the current student request) or dumps the current allocation 236 (reject the current student request) from preference list of the project. The process continues 237 iteratively until no more unallocated student. Intuitively this algorithm involved matching N 238 239 X N items iteratively, and hence the time complexity Gale Shapley algorithm is $O(n^2)$. 240 The correctness of this algorithm can be viewed from two perspective; stability and perfection. In the stability aspect, Gale Shapley claim that at the end of matching no swap 241 between pairs that will make a happier match than the initial matching will be possible. And 242

the perfection of the algorithm is such that all the member of two parties involved most be

- 244 matched to a partner (Chiarandini, Fagerberg and Gualandi, 2017).
- 245

246 **7.** Conclusion

The goal has been to investigate the different concept of stable marriage problem algorithm and how they can be deployed in student project allocation process. This goal has been achieved as we have succeeded in developing a system using an algorithm base on Gale Sharply algorithm that is capable of handling project allocation.

The system was tested with some sample data of students and supervisors. The algorithm was supplied with input (students and supervisors preferences) and the output was produced by

running the algorithm as shown in previous sections.

Therefore, it can be deducted from this research that, stability in allocating student project will result to a quality of the research since student are allocated project from their

preferences. We also show that deploying stable marriage algorithm in student project

219

Further research can be conducted to extend the allocation algorithmm to enable monitoring

the number of project that each supervisor could be assign to avoid overloading, since

260 problem arise when the number of students who have chosen the supervisor as their first

choice exceeds the supervisor's supervision capacity (Salami and Mamman, 2016).

262 References

- Aderanti F. A., Amosa R.T., and Olawatobiloba A. A. (2016). Development of student
 project allocation system using matching algorithm. *International conference of science, engineering & environmental technology*. 1(22), 153-160.
- 266Azevedo, E. (2016). A Supply and Demand Framework for Two-Sided Matching Markets. Journal of267politicaleconomy,[online]124(5).Availableat:268https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/pdfplus/10.1086/687476 [Accessed 7 Aug. 2018].
- Chiarandini, M., Fagerberg, R. and Gualandi, S. (2017). Handling preferences in student-project
 allocation. Annals of Operations Research.
- Deng, Y., Panigrahi, D. and Waggoner, B. (2017). The complexity of stable matchings under
 substitutable preferences. Association for the advancement of artificial intelligence. [online] Available
 at: http://www.aaai.org [Accessed 1 Aug. 2018].
- El-Atta, A. and Moussa, M. (2009). Student Project Allocation with Preference Lists over (Student,
 Project) Pairs. 2009 Second International Conference on Computer and Electrical Engineering.
- F. Manlove, D. and O'Malley, G. (2008). Student-Project Allocation with preferences over

279 Projects. Journal of Discrete Algorithms, [online] 6(4), pp.553-560. Available at:

280 http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1570866708000476 [Accessed 11 Aug.

281 2015].

269

272

- 282 Fleiner, T. (2014). On Stable Matchings and Flows. *Algorithms*, 7(1), pp.1-14.
- 283 Gonczarowski, Y., Nisan, N., Ostrovsky, R. and Rosenbaum, W. (2018). A Stable Marriage Requires
 284 Communication. [ebook] Available at: https://arxiv.org/pdf/1405.7709.pdf [Accessed 5 Aug. 2018].
- Iwama, K. and Miyazaki, S. (2008). A Survey of the Stable Marriage Problem and Its
 Variants. *International Conference on Informatics Education and Research for Knowledge-*
- 287 *Circulating Society (icks 2008).*
- Lightfoot, S. (2016). Solving the student project allocation problem. MSc Dissertation. The University
 of Manchester.
- Moussa, M. and Abu El-Atta, A. (2011). A Visual implementation of student project
 allocation. *International Journal of computer science and engineering*, vol.3(1793-8201).
- Salami, H. and Mamman, E. (2016). A Genetic Algorithm for Allocating Project Supervisors to
 Students. International Journal of Intelligent Systems and Applications, 8(10), pp.51-59.
- 294 Sanfoundry, (2013). Java Program to Implement Gale Shapley Algorithm Sanfoundry.
- 295 [Online] Available at: http://www.sanfoundry.com/java-program-gale-shapley-algorithm
- 296 [Accessed 10 Aug. 2015].

Comment [DSA7]: Remove. Check for accuracy for all the references. Use a uniform referencing style

- 297 Teo, C., Sethuraman, J. and Tan, W. (2001). Gale-Shapley Stable Marriage Problem
- 298 Revisited: Strategic Issues and Applications. *Management science*, [online] 47(9), pp.1252-
- 299 1267. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.47.9.1252.9784 [Accessed 10 Aug. 2015].
- Tetsuo, H., Toshinori, Y. and Michio, K. (1999). New fast iteration algorithm for the solution
 of generalized stable marriage problem. *Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, 1999. IEEE SMC '99*
- 302 Conference Proceedings. 1999 IEEE International Conference, 6, pp.1051 1056.
- Wan-Hong, I. (2017). A web-based project allocation system. MSc project. The University of Hong
 Kong.
- 305 W. Irving R, Gusfield D. Amazon.com: The Stable Marriage Problem: Structure and
- 306 Algorithms (Foundations of Computing) (9780262515528): Dan Gusfield, Robert W. Irving:
- 307 Books. Amazoncom. 1989. Available at: http://www.amazon.com/The-Stable-Marriage-
- Problem-Foundations/dp/0262515520. Accessed June 17, 2015.

Comment [DSA8]: See comment above