

3 Types

BizM00C Discussion paper 3

Existing types of M00Cs and approaches to M00C didactics

BizM00C – BizM00C – Knowledge Alliance to enable a European-wide exploitation of the potential of M00Cs for the world of business

Programme: Erasmus+ | Key Action 2 | Knowledge Alliances

Reference Number: 562286-EPP- 1-2015- 1-AT- EPPKA2-KA

Grant agreement number: 2015-2929 / 001-001

Project Duration: 36 months, 1/1/2016 – 31/12/2018

Existing types of M00Cs and approaches to M00C didactics

Authors: Martin Weller & Sarah Bridgman (Open University)

1. Abstract

This paper examines the pedagogy associated with M00Cs. It explores how the historical development of M00Cs led to two main schools of thought regarding pedagogy, and examines the European context. The influence of learning design and open pedagogy is also considered.

2. Introduction

In examining the pedagogic approaches taken by MOOCs, it is necessary to first consider their history, as two different strands emerged, which are still evident in MOOCs. The development of open courses initially grew out of the broader open education movement. There was a coalescence of interest around running open courses from a number of people associated with open education. David Wiley ran a campus based course in 2007, and made it open to anyone online to participate, as did Alec Couros, operating an 'open boundary' course. However, the title of founding MOOC is often given to Connectivism and Connective Knowledge (CCK08) run by George Siemens and Stephen Downes in 2008. It was commentary on this course that gave rise to the term MOOC, jointly attributed to Dave Cormier and Bryan Alexander.

These early MOOCs were characterised by an interest in exploring the pedagogic possibilities that being open and networked offered. The subject matter of these early courses was related to the mode of presentation, so courses were in topics such as open education, digital identity or networked pedagogy. As with early e-learning courses which would often be about the subject of e-learning itself, these early stages of experimentation focused on subjects where the medium was the message. But as with e-learning, this soon broadened out to encompass all topics.

Another characteristic of these early MOOCs was that they were experimental in terms of technology, both by necessity and design. These MOOCs used a combination of open technologies, such as WordPress and Twitter, some institutional hosting through tools such as Moodle, and even some self-created tools such as Stephen Downes's gRSShopper. Learning to use these tools, and to make connections across the open internet was seen as a key aim for these early MOOCs.

Then in 2011, MOOCs took a very different turn when Sebastian Thrun launched the Stanford Artificial Intelligence course, with over 120,000 enrolled learners. This attracted much media attention and other universities followed suit. Harvard and MIT created EdX, Coursera was launched by Daphne Koller and Andrew Ng with venture capital funding and Thrun founded Udacity. The year 2012 was deemed 'Year of the MOOC' by the New York Times (Pappano 2012) as most major US universities signed up to one or other of the main providers, or launched their own courses. If we take Coursera as an example, as it is the most prominent of the MOOC providers then it has over 500 courses, from 107 universities and over 5 million learners enrolled (Protalinski 2013). Pedagogically these new MOOCs were very different from the early ones pioneered by the open education movement. They tended to be institutional, based on a proprietary platform and driven by a strongly instructivist pedagogy. Whereas the initial MOOCs had emphasised the importance of networking, many new MOOCs were focused on video instruction and automatic assessment. The distinction was made between cMOOCs for the early, connectivist type MOOCs and xMOOCs for the new, didactic models (Siemens 2012).

3. MOOC Pedagogy

Taking the cMOOC and xMOOC distinction, the approaches to pedagogy can be broadly summarised as:

Connectivist or cMOOC

- Based on connectivist theories
- Emphasis on connecting learners rather than presenting content
- Focus on network
- Learners often involved in construction of the curriculum

xMOOC

- Modelled on traditional course materials, theories and

- teaching methods (e.g. lectures)
- Video content and automated testing or quizzes
- Linear, instructor-guided
- High quality content

To this dichotomy a range of variations has been added, including SPOCs (Short, Private Online Courses), VOOs (Vocational Open Online Courses), SOOs (Selectively Open Online Courses), mini-MOOCs, mobile MOOCs, etc. What this flurry of acronyms demonstrates is that MOOCs inspired a resurgence in interest in elearning generally, even if some of these variations seem to get quite far from the original characteristics of MOOCs being open.

This distinction is overly simplistic as there are often collaborative elements in xMOOCs, and also cMOOCs can be quite structured. It is perhaps best viewed as a continuum; very structured, linear at one end and loosely structured, networked at the other.

While different pedagogies may be suitable for different topics, or groups of learners, it is often argued that one is 'better' than another. This will depend on the goals of the MOOC. Jordan (2014) conducted a study of MOOC completion rates. The most significant factor influencing dropout rates was course length (with shorter courses have higher completion rates). The MOOC platform and the MOOC type (cMOOC vs xMOOC) did not have an impact on completion rate (although the data was limited to only thirteen MOOCs this comparison).

4. European context

To appreciate the European response to MOOCs, they need to be placed in the wider context of open education initiatives. Open education has a rich history in Europe, with the founding of the Open University in 1969 and similar universities in Netherlands, Spain and Germany. Open Universities represent one interpretation of 'openness' in education, namely open to

places, people and methods – so it developed an open entry, part-time, distance education model. Open education was thus a recognised and respected discipline in Europe, more so than in the US, and so MOOCs were seen as part of this existing context.

Another influence on open education was open source software, which gave rise to open licenses and the concept of publicly shared goods over the Internet, and then Open Educational Resources (OER). The UK in particular had considerable OER investment through national frameworks funded by JISC (the Joint Information Systems Committee) and the Higher Education Academy (HEA) OER programme, which promoted many small scale OER projects from 2009 to 2012 (<https://jisc.ac.uk/guides/open-educational-resources>). JISC also established JORUM, a national OER repository. Although this was closed in 2015, and the OER programme has now finished, it was significant in raising the profile of openly licensed, and free resources. In addition the Open University launched the OpenLearn repository in 2006, which has released over 10,000 hours of material and has over 4 million visitors per year.

MOOCs thus entered into a higher education context that was well acquainted with concepts of openness. These influences are highlighted in Figure 1, from Yuan and Powell.




Figure 1:

M00Cs and Open Education Timeline

[Reproduced from M00Cs and Open Education: Implications for Higher Education by Li Yuan & Stephen Powell. Published under a CC--By license]

This context may account for why Europe was relatively slow in adopting M00Cs, as they were not seen as revolutionary as they were deemed in the North American context. There was some collaboration with early M00C pioneers such as George Siemens and Stephen Downes, but it was not until the year 2012 that universities started launching M00Cs. The Hasso Plattner Institute delivered M00Cs on its own platform, focusing on engineering topics (<https://hpi.de/>). UNED similarly offered a range of M00Cs in 2012 on its own platform. Edinburgh was the first UK university to partner with major M00C providers Coursera and EdX. These were largely xM00C in type, and the university entered into their provision in an experimental manner, to investigate the M00C phenomenon, rather than with an explicit goal such as recruiting students. They stated “Our Edinburgh M00Cs offered us a route to experimentation with online delivery methods at large scale, and gave us a chance to learn lessons that might be applied elsewhere in our educational portfolio” (M00Cs@Edinburgh Group 2013). Spain was the most active European country in M00Cs, with the UK, Germany, Italy, Denmark and the Netherlands all developing M00Cs from different universities, and France becoming increasingly active in 2014. There was little engagement with the major M00C providers, the preference being for universities to develop their own platforms. There is now wide coverage of M00Cs across Europe in most languages, on a variety of platforms (http://openeducationeuropa.eu/en/open_education_scoreboard).

Other experiments were conducted elsewhere, for example the OLDS M00C (<http://www.olds.ac.uk/>) focused on learning design, which was funded by JISC and run by the Open University. This used a more cM00C approach, combining different technologies

and emphasising a networked, peer supported approach.

The German based companyiversity is one of the main European competitors to the main MOOC providers. It developed out of a learning management system, and was launched in 2013. Most iversity courses follow an xMOOC type approach, ending with a final assessment or exam which can be taken on-site, online or in an exam centre as a final project that has to be marked by the instructor. Universities that offer a MOOC on iversity have the option of offering European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS) credits. In this practice, iversity is unusual for MOOC providers in offering the potential for recognised university accreditation.

In 2012 Open University Vice Chancellor Martin Bean announced the formation of FutureLearn. This was a company developing a MOOC platform, partnering with UK universities. It was a response to the US-centric focus of MOOCs thus far. With 29 UK universities and more overseas, FutureLearn is the biggest UK MOOC provider, and aims to tread something of a middle-ground between the very distributed, unstructured model of cMOOCs and the very centralised xMOOCs. There has been a focus on using the scale of MOOCs to facilitate elements of social input. The platform claims to be based on the work of Hattie (2009) on visible learning. This was based on a meta study of effective strategies in education, and recommends the following techniques: Student self-reporting grades, formative evaluation, teacher clarity, reciprocal teaching, feedback, teacher-student relationships, metacognitive strategies, self-verbalisation/ questioning, teacher professional development, and problem--solving teaching. In reality the degree to which this is implemented will vary between partners and courses.

The experimental cMOOC approach has remained largely on the periphery in Europe, confined to individual experiments such as the OLDS MOOC and H817 Open (<http://www.open.edu/openlearn/education/open--education/content-section-0>). The focus of these courses has

been as much in the types of technology used as the underlying pedagogy. These courses place a strong emphasis on users owning their own space, and making use of the network. Thus learners are encouraged to set up their own blog space, to use twitter (or other social media tools such as Google +), hashtags to find and communicate with others, and an aggregated blog that pulls together different contributions. These courses were influenced often by early open courses such as DS106 (dsl06.us) which have taken a much more student centric approach, for example, with students suggesting assignments and choosing which assignments they wish to complete.

Some European universities have signed up for Coursera, and similar platforms, many universities have launched MOOCs on their own platforms. For example Uninettuno in Italy delivers a range of MOOCs in both Italian, Arabic, French and English, on their own platform (<http://www.uninettunouniversity.net/en/mooc.aspx>). These are largely xMOOC in format. Similarly, UNED in Spain offers a number of xMOOC type courses, focused around short videos and online assessment, using their own platform (<https://coma.uned.es/>).


5. State of the art

In terms of pedagogy the early experimental phase of MOOCs was superseded by a focus on platforms and business models during the period of MOOC expansion. While many of the xMOOCs are high quality production, in terms of pedagogy they are often limited, based on passive video watching and taking online quizzes. However, having gone through this phase of early enthusiasm, there is some evidence that universities are now becoming interested in pedagogic experimentation again. Because MOOCs do not carry formal credit and are not paid for by learners, they are the ideal vehicle for conducting experiments. This can be in terms of A/B testing, for example

testing different resources, the placing of these resources within a course, new technologies, etc. By running these across two separate presentations of the same MOOC and controlling other variables then the impact of one aspect on performance can be isolated.


Another area of interest is in the use of learning design in implementing and evaluating MOOCs. In the UK JISC and CETIS funded a number of learning design projects, which, as with OERs, had the benefit of raising awareness of the approach. One large project was JISC OULDI (<http://www.open.ac.uk/blogs/OULDI/>) which developed a number of learning design tools. FutureLearn runs regular learning design workshops for its partners, using the Open University adaptation of these tools.

A version of these tools was used to map a number of MOOCs in 2013, mapping resource type and their function in the course. For example an xMOOC with a mixed media approach might have a resource profile like this:




How these resources are used can also be mapped, depending on whether their function is Content (delivering teaching material), Guidance (offering support and guidance for learners), Demonstration (learners demonstrating their understanding for example through assessment or blog posting), or Communications (for example posting to a forum).

An xMOOC (Udacity's Introduction to Psychology) has a strong emphasis on content:



The pedagogy in this course is focused on watching videos and then taking tests. It is a useful way to approach a topic for beginners and covers a good deal of content in a short course.

Whereas a cMOOC such as DS106, has a broader mix with guidance, and demonstration, as learners are encouraged to experiment and create artefacts for themselves. Here the aim is more on developing skills and ways of thinking.



These representations were created retrospectively, from existing MOOCs. It is possible to consider which 'pattern' of activity and resources a MOOC should have before developing it, given the overall aims of the course.

6. Possible future trends

The future trends in MOOC pedagogy will be influenced by other factors, particularly the sustainability of MOOCs overall. After initial enthusiasm and extensive investment in MOOCs, universities will now expect them to return results. Weller (2015) argues that there are five questions universities will now be seeking clarification on:

- Costs to student – many MOOC providers are selling accreditation and the overall cost required in order to amass enough credits for a degree can now be compared with formal offerings, which have benefits of support.
- MOOC production costs – initially many thought MOOCs would be cheap to produce but they have become

increasingly expensive. Hollands & Tirthali, (2014) put the cost between \$152K and \$244K per M00C.

- Effectiveness as recruitment tools – one of the potential benefits of M00Cs is that they can lead to formal student enrolment. There is now sufficient data to examine whether they are effective marketing tools, and can compare them against other outlets (eg advertising) in money spent per recruited student.
- Demographics of M00C learners – many universities engaged with M00Cs as part of their social mission and broadening access remit. However the typical demographic of M00C learners tends to be highly qualified, from privileged socio-economic backgrounds (Hansen and Reich 2015).
- New learners – on their initial presentation a M00C may get high numbers of enrolments but this then usually decreases for subsequent ones. In addition many learners take multiple M00Cs. So once this audience has been reached there may not many new learners are to be found. The M00C business model will rely on large numbers across multiple presentations.

None of these are factors relating to pedagogy, but they will have an impact on whether M00Cs continue to be invested in, and what role the university sees for them. If M00Cs are viewed as being a showcase for the university then they will often have high production values, but relatively instructivist pedagogy. If they are viewed as tools for experimenting, then they may be lower in production costs, but more diverse in terms of pedagogy.

The 'open' in M00Cs refers to the absence of cost or entry requirements – they are openly accessible by anyone. However, open has many interpretations, and a future trend might be increased focus on what this means in terms of pedagogy. Having invested in M00Cs, universities and academics will begin to explore what they can accomplish differently in this

space. Paul Stacey (2013) makes the following recommendations regarding open pedagogy:

- Be as open as possible. Go beyond open enrolments and use open pedagogies that leverage the entire web, not just the specific content in the MOOC platform. As part of your open pedagogy strategy use OER and openly license your resources using Creative Commons licenses in a way that allows reuse, revision, remix, and redistribution. Make your MOOC platform open source software. Publish the learning analytics data you collect as open data using a CC0 license.
- Use tried and proven modern online learning pedagogies, not campus classroom based didactic learning pedagogies which we know are ill-suited to online learning.
- Use peer-to-peer pedagogies over self-study. We know this improves learning outcomes. The cost of enabling a network of peers is the same as that of networking content – essentially zero.
- Use social learning, including blogs, chat, discussion forums, wikis, and group assignments.
- Leverage massive participation – have all students contribute something that adds to or improves the course overall.

Examples of open pedagogy would include Jim Groom's DS106, an open course which encourages learners to create daily artefacts, suggest assignments, establish their own space online and be part of a community that extends beyond the course both geographically and temporally. Dave Cormier starts his educational technology course every year by asking students to create a contract stating 'that each of you decide how much work you would like to do for what grade. Individual assignments are given a "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory" assessment upon completion' (Cormier 2013). Courses such as Octel (<http://octel.alt.ac.uk>) have learners create their own blogs, and this is used for all their solutions. The course

then automatically aggregates all of these contributions into one central blog. All of this is conducted in the open.

7. Conclusions

The cMOOC and xMOOC distinction in MOOCs is the main categorisation used in considering their pedagogy. This grew out of the manner in which MOOCs were developed, and reflects how MOOCs are viewed by their developers. The function of MOOCs can be to recruit students, to act as a shop window, to reach new audiences and to allow experimentation. Depending on which of these motivations is most prevalent will influence the type of pedagogy adopted.

The dominance of commercial MOOC providers such as Coursera, EdX and Udacity in North America, has shaped the pedagogy they have adopted. This platform dominance is not as prevalent in Europe, with many universities developing their own platforms. The two main European MOOC providers areiversity and FutureLearn. While the xMOOC approach is still prevalent, there is a mixture of other elements within many of these courses and platforms.

Developing a learning design approach and exploring the open aspects of pedagogy is likely to be a key area in terms of the pedagogic development of MOOCs. However, MOOCs have received a good deal of media attention and may now be subject to a backlash. They also have to demonstrate their value to providers and sustainability. The pedagogy of MOOCs cannot be viewed in isolation from these other factors, which will shape the nature of MOOCs over the next five years.

Note

References

Haggard, S., Brown, S., Mills, R., Tait, A., Warburton, S., Lawton, W., & Angulo, T. (2013). The Maturing of the MOOC: literature review of massive open online courses and other forms of online distance learning. *Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, UK Government*.

Hansen, J.D. and Reich, J., 2015, March. Socioeconomic status and MOOC enrollment: enriching demographic information with external datasets. In *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Learning Analytics and Knowledge* (pp. 59-63). ACM.

Hattie, John (2008). *Visible Learning: A Synthesis of Over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement*. NY: Routledge. p. 392. ISBN 978-0-415-47618-8.

Hollands, F. M., & Tirthali, D. (2014). MOOCs: expectations and reality. Full report. Center for Benefit- Cost Studies of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, NY.

Retrieved from:

http://cbcse.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/MOOCs_Expectations_and_Reality.pdf

Jordan, K. (2014). Initial trends in enrolment and completion of massive open online courses. *The International Review Of Research In Open And Distributed Learning*, 15(1). Retrieved from <http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/1651>

MOOCs@Edinburgh Group (2013) MOOCs @ Edinburgh 2013: Report #1. <https://www.era.lib.ed.ac.uk/handle/1842/6683>

Pappano, L. (2012) 'The Year of the MOOC'. *New York Times*, Nov 2, 2012

<http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/04/education/edlife/massive-open-online-courses-are-multiplying-at-a-rapid-pace.html?>

Protalinski, E. (2013) 'Coursera partners with 13 new

institutions to pass 100 total, eclipses 5 million students and 500 courses too'. *The NextWeb*, October 24, 2013
<http://thenextweb.com/insider/2013/10/24/coursera-partners-13-institutions-pass-100-total-sees-5-million-students-500-courses/#!ALMfi>

Siemens, G. (2012) 'MOOCs are really a platform'
<http://www.elearnspace.org/blog/2012/07/25/moocs-are-really-a-platform/>

Stacey, P. (2013) 'The Pedagogy Of MOOCs'
<http://edtechfrontier.com/2013/05/11/the-pedagogy-of-moocs/>

Weller, M (2015) 2016 – the year of MOOC hard questions
<http://blog.edtechie.net/mooc/2016-the-year-of-mooc-hard-questions/>

Yuan, L., Powell, S., & CETIS, J. (2013). MOOCs and open education: Implications for higher education.