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ABSTRACT

Social comparison theory asserts that we establish our social and personal worth by comparing ourselves to others. In in-person learning environments, social comparison offers students critical feedback on how to behave and be successful. By contrast, online learning environments afford fewer social cues to facilitate social comparison. Can increased availability of such cues promote effective self-regulatory behavior and achievement in Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs)?

We developed a personalized feedback system that facilitates social comparison with previously successful learners based on an interactive visualization of multiple behavioral indicators. Across four randomized controlled trials in MOOCs (overall N = 33,726), we find: (1) the availability of social comparison cues significantly increases completion rates, (2) this type of feedback benefits highly educated learners, and (3) learners’ cultural context plays a significant role in their course engagement and achievement.
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1. INTRODUCTION

A mechanism for increasing access to higher education content, Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) have afforded millions of people worldwide the opportunity to learn for little or no cost. To achieve this unprecedented scale, MOOCs provide the same material to all learners, no matter what background, motivation, and skill set they possess. Yet this approach falls short of leveraging the technical possibilities of contemporary educational resources to offer learners personalized support, such as giving guidance to learners who are less adept at regulating their learning process over several weeks to achieve mastery. Low course completion rates (typically between 5-10%) highlight the need for additional support in MOOCs. While many learners have no intention to complete MOOCs and instead use them to fulfill alternative needs (e.g., to refresh their memory of a specific topic or to meet new people), the majority of learners who are motivated and committed to complete the course still fail to achieve their goal.

Most learners report that they could not find the time to keep up with the course, a challenge that is related to insufficient self-regulatory abilities. Self-regulated learning (SRL; i.e., the ability to plan, monitor, and actively control one’s learning process) is associated with a higher likelihood of achieving personal course goals in MOOCs, including course completion. However, the current design of MOOCs does not support learners to engage in SRL. In particular, most MOOC platforms do not provide learners with personalized feedback beyond grades, and thus, learners may not know if their engagement in the course is conducive to achieving their learning goals.

We propose a technological solution that facilitates social comparison to help learners regulate their learning behavior to support course completion. According to social comparison theory, people establish their social and personal worth by comparing themselves to others. Offering learners the opportunity to compare their behavior with that of their peers promotes increased student achievement in formal learning environments. Students in in-person classrooms can easily identify role models and regularly monitor these role models’ behavior and compare it to their own. However, this affordance of social comparison is missing in most online “classrooms.” Instead, online learners need to be self-directed and regulate their learning process independently with sparse social and normative signals.

In addition to evaluating the impact of providing learners with a personalized feedback system, we further examined the potential of adjusting the framing of the feedback...
to match learners’ cultural context. Framing feedback in a way that is consistent with the norms and achievement-based motivation of learners’ cultural context is expected to support internalization and behavior change. Prior work has observed differences in the way learners from different countries and cultures interact with MOOCs [11, 22, 29]. We define cultural context based on two established country-level cultural dimensions: individualism by Hofstede et al. [14] and tightness by Gelfand et al. [9].

We explore the extent to which insights from social comparison and cultural psychology can be translated to support learners in MOOCs. We evaluate how to offer feedback based on social comparison in an online learning environment. To this end, we design, develop, and empirically evaluate a personalized and scalable feedback system that presents MOOC learners with a visual comparison of their behavior to that of their successful peers who successfully completed a past iteration the course. We deployed the system in four edX MOOCs offered by the Delft University of Technology with a total of N = 33,726 learners. In each deployment we drew on research findings across multiple domains including learning analytics, educational psychology, and social & cultural psychology to inform the design on both the feedback we provide (i.e. the behavioural metrics shown to the learners) and how the feedback is framed (e.g., individualistic- or collectivist- oriented framing).

Our work extends prior research by testing a theory-informed technological solution in a large and diverse population (i.e., MOOC learners) for a prolonged period of time. These are our main findings:

- The presence of social-comparison based feedback increases course completion rates.
- The Feedback System intervention only benefits learners who are already highly educated.
- Cultural context plays a significant role in MOOC learners’ course engagement and achievement: learners from countries with low cultural tightness consistently outperform learners of high cultural tightness.

2. BACKGROUND

In this section we provide the theoretical and empirical underpinnings to our work which facilitates social comparisons with personalized feedback. We discuss (i) previous studies on incorporating feedback in online learning, (ii) the theory of social comparison and its application to learning, and (iii) past research on the impact of learners’ cultural context on learning behavior.

Feedback.

Providing feedback is one of the most effective teaching strategies to improve student achievement [12]. Given the scale of MOOCs it is impossible for a teacher or teaching assistant to personally monitor and attend to each learner’s unique needs. Therefore, up to this point, the majority of feedback solutions developed for MOOCs and other online learning environments have been for the course instructor, typically in the form of a dashboard representing aggregated learner data [26, 32, 42].

While teacher-facing feedback systems can provide key insights for improving the course experience, they are unlikely to address the issue that many learners feel lost and isolated in MOOCs [21]. Personalized feedback promises to promote effective SRL behavior by facilitating self-monitoring of learning processes [18]. One of the most important lines of research which aims to provide learners with personalized feedback is that of Open Learner Models (OLM), an educational interface that gives learners insight into their current knowledge state and activity patterns, which are typically unavailable to them [3]. By allowing learners to visualize and reflect on their own learning and achievements, OLMs have been proven to work as powerful meta-cognitive feedback tools that impact learners’ use of SRL strategies [3, 10]. We designed the Feedback System informed by prior work on the design of accessible, understandable, and scrutable [20] learner models [5, 19].

There has been little progress in developing and deploying personalized feedback for large-scale MOOC environments, and most work focuses on supporting teachers [39]. In the present research, instead of presenting aggregate data for all learners in a course, we addresses the challenge of delivering individualized, targeted feedback to each learner based on her behavior in the course relative to her peers’ behavior to facilitate social comparison. The present research contributes an empirically evaluated scalable and personalized feedback intervention to the literature on learning analytics. Recent studies have begun to run controlled experiments [56], but most feedback system evaluations thus far explain the design, development, and implementation considerations without rigorously testing whether the added support contributes to behavior change or learning gains [12].

Social Comparison.

The feedback learners receive through the Feedback System is grounded in social comparison theory, initially proposed by Festinger [8]. He hypothesizes that, guided by a drive to continuously improve, people evaluate their abilities through comparison to others when they are lacking objective means of comparison. His theory has received empirical validation and found application in various domains, including marketing, health psychology, interpersonal relationships, and also in education [6, 27]. In one study, social comparison was used to improve the Web search behavior of novice users [1]. The authors found that showing non-expert searchers visual indicators of the search behaviors of expert searchers resulted in closer alignment with effective behavior and, therefore, more successful search task completion among novices.

Social comparison is an inherent phenomenon in traditional classroom environments because of both the visibility and accessibility of similar peers [27]. Multiple studies have demonstrated that comparing oneself to self-selected peers who perform slightly better has a beneficial effect on middle school students’ grades [2, 15]. Forced comparisons also have a beneficial effect on performance when the target of comparison is performing slightly better than the learner, although no effects were found when there was a big performance gap between two sides [16].

In the context of a small online learning platform (N=55), Papanikolaou [35] investigated students’ attitudes towards viewing the learner model of others. Her results showed that when learners compare their behavior to that of a “desired” one, they are then motivated to recognize and adapt their learning strategies. She suggests that the “desired” state should be generated based on real data coming from

https://www.edx.org/
peers who are “worth following.” We build on this insight by considering MOOC graduates of previous editions as the basis for creating a role model.

Guerra et al. [10] integrated social comparison features in the form of peer and class progress in the design of an intelligent interface for a learning management system to provide additional motivation and navigation support. This approach showed a positive effect on engagement and efficiency in two studies (N=89), but no significant effects on learner performance in terms of final grades or learning gains. On the other hand, Rogers et al. [37] investigated “discouragement by peer excellence” in a MOOC setting and concluded that learners who are exposed to examples of excellent peer achievements risked feeling less capable of performing at the level of those peers. The Feedback System is different in that it shows the behavior patterns of the average completing learner, so as not to risk discouragement.

The present research adds to the literature on social comparison in the online learning environments by investigating the effects of forced comparison of learners’ performance and engagement in a MOOC setting. With the Feedback System, MOOC learners can visualize their behavior compared to that of successful learners, offering them a model against which they can evaluate their own study habits.

Culture

MOOC learners come from all over the world and cover a profoundly wide range of cultural contexts. Prior MOOC research has observed a learner’s culture as affecting behavior within the course. For example, Liu et al. [29] explored MOOC learner behavior in the form of “quiz-based activity profiles” in relation to Hofstede’s cultural dimensions [14]. The authors clustered countries based on similarity across four dimensions of culture and found significant differences between clusters in terms of behavior, supporting the hypothesis that cultural factors are related to the way learners behave in a MOOC. Our research zooms in on two particular cultural dimensions: individualism [14] and tightness [9].

Individualism is one of Hofstede’s [14] country-level dimensions which characterizes the variation in cultures around the world. Cultures high in individualism are those which emphasize the individual as an independent actor with loose social relations [14]. Its inverse, collectivism, is characterized by cultures of tightly-knit social relations and great care for the well-being of all [14].

Gelfand et al. [9] conceived an index that ranks countries by their cultural tightness: tight cultures are those with “strong norms and a low tolerance of deviant behavior,” and conversely, cultures of low tightness (or loose cultures) are those with “weak social norms and a high tolerance of deviant behavior” [9]. The present study attempts to invoke a learner’s cultural context so that it resonates with the learner, facilitates internalization of the feedback, and promotes positive behavior change.

Prior work has also found one’s regulatory focus (motivated by either pushing for success—promotion—versus avoiding failure—prevention) to be highly moderated by culture [13, 31]. Specifically, cultures of high individualism and low tightness are more aligned with promotional focus, and cultures of high collectivism and high tightness are aligned with prevention focus [13, 29, 34]. To strengthen the framing texts in the experiment below, we supplement the individualism and tightness texts with either promotion- or prevention-oriented regulatory focus accordingly.

3. MOOC OVERVIEW

For our experiments, we employed our personalized Feedback System to learners across four MOOCs—all of them re-runs (i.e. not in their first edition)—provided by the Delft University of Technology on the edX platform:

WaterX The Drinking Water Treatment MOOC teaches technologies for drinking water treatment. Its second edition ran between 12 January and 29 March 2016. It is a seven-week course with 63 instructional videos and 42 summative quiz questions. A total of 10,943 learners registered for the course. To complete the course, learners had to gain at least 60% of all scores (i.e. passing threshold $\tau_{pass} = 60\%$).

UrbanX The Urban Sewage Treatment MOOC learners are taught how to design and manage solutions for urban sewage. The second edition of the seven-week course ran between 12 April and 20 June 2016 with 8,137 learners. There are 272 summative quiz questions ($\tau_{pass} = 59\%$) and 71 videos.

BusinessX Responsible Innovation: Ethics, Safety and Technology teaches learners how to deal with risks and ethical questions arising from new technologies. 2,352 learners registered to the second edition which ran between 11 April and 14 June 2016. The course has 79 summative quiz questions ($\tau_{pass} = 40\%$) and 54 videos.

CalcX Pre-university Calculus is the only MOOC in our list that targets beginning Bachelor students and was designed as a refreshment course before entering higher education. The third iteration of this course ran from 28 June 2016 through 27 September 2016 with 12,294 learners, 85 videos, and 327 summative quiz questions ($\tau_{pass} = 60\%$).

We found the WaterX, UrbanX, and BusinessX MOOCs to attract a similar population of learners: two thirds of the enrolled learners were male, the median age was 28, and the majority of learners held a BSc or MSc degree. The learner population in the CalcX course was instead targeted at high-school students who were about to enter university. While the gender balance was consistent with other MOOCs (30% female), the median age was only 25, and the most common education level was a high school diploma (45%).

For each learner, we collected all available edX log traces such as the learners’ clicks, views, dwell time on the edX platform, and their provided answers to the quiz questions.

4. APPROACH

In Section 4.1 we first introduce the research questions driving our work before detailing the design of our Feedback System which was deployed in different instantiations across the four MOOCs just described.

4.1 Research Questions

The first Research Question and Hypotheses are based primarily on the social comparison literature in the context of education and learning environments:

RQ1 Does social comparison-based learner feedback lead to increased achievement and increased self-regulatory behavior for MOOC learners?

H1.1 In line with previous findings [1, 33, 34], we expect that providing learners a comparison of their own behavior to that of previously successful peers will increase learner achievement (measured in terms of
completing/passing the course) and engagement (activity levels within the course environment).

H1.2 Learners will change the aspects of their behavior that the Feedback System makes them aware of.

H1.3 Certain feedback metrics (and combinations of metrics) will be more effective than others in leading to desirable changes in student behavior.

Based on prior work which has shown that learners from different cultural contexts learn and behave differently in MOOCs [11, 22, 23, 29], we explore:

RQ2 Which learners benefit most from the Feedback System? We also examine the differences in learning behavior according to learners’ cultural context. Based on Hofstede’s [14] and Gelfand’s [9] cultural dimensions, we expect learners in different cultural contexts to be affected by feedback differently. The final research question focuses on the extent to which a learner’s cultural context affects feedback:

RQ3 Does feedback framed in line with a learner’s cultural context lead to increased achievement and self-regulatory behavior compared to a culturally mismatched framing?

H3.1 Feedback in line with a learner’s cultural individualism index [14] will increase its impact on the learner: learners from high-individualism cultures will show more engagement than those from high-collectivism cultures from individual-promotional framing; learners from high-collectivism cultures will show more engagement from collectivist-prevention framing.

H3.2 Feedback in alignment with a learner’s cultural tightness [9] will increase its impact on the learner: highly tight cultures will benefit from the collectivist framing; and the inverse applies for individualist framing.

4.2 Feedback System Design

Recall, that our design rationale of the Feedback System (presented as the “Learning Tracker” to learners in the courses, cf. Figure 1) is to provide learners feedback about their own behavior that enables them to make well-informed decisions about their learning strategies going forward [14] as a result of increased self-awareness. The Feedback System can be thought of as a mirror with which learners can view and react to their own, previously-invisible behavior. Since SRK skills are generalizable, the design should be agnostic to the content of each specific MOOC the feedback system is deployed in. We identified three key criteria for our system design:

- **Traceable**: we can only provide feedback on behavior we can extract and derive from edX’s log traces.\(^2\)
- **Scrutable** [20]: afford learners the ability to intuitively understand and explore the information presented;
- **Actionable**: learners should be able to take action and change their behavior based on what they learn from the presented feedback.

After surveying the literature on learner model visualizations, we settled on employing a single spider chart to visualize six metrics of learners’ behavior in relation to that of their successful peers, as shown in Figure 1. The spider chart’s key benefits include: (i) a single, embodied representation of multiple metrics, (ii) numerous indicators displayed in a small space, (iii) a simple representation of metrics—data is shown as single points along radial straight lines, and (iv) easily comparable—information is represented as differently colored areas that can be layered [38].

In all four courses, the experimental conditions were not made explicitly known to the learners; the Feedback System appeared seamlessly integrated with the rest of the course materials.

We operationalized previously successful students, or “role models”, as learners who earned a passing grade in the previous edition of the MOOC (note that this setup requires that subsequent editions of the same MOOC have few changes). We updated the Feedback System every week (based on the learners’ activities on the platform in all weeks leading up to the current one) so that the learners could see an up-to-date representation of their activities as compared to that of the role models. The learners’ behaviors in the courses were tracked by the standard edX tracking log system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback metrics</th>
<th>WaterX</th>
<th>UrbanX</th>
<th>BusinessX</th>
<th>CalX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quiz submission timeliness (days)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time on the platform (in minutes)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time watching videos (in hours)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of videos accessed</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of quiz questions attempted</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of time spent on videos while on the platform (in %)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average time on the platform per week (in hours)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of revisited video lectures</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of forum visits</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of forum contributions</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of time spent on quizzes</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of sessions per week</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean session length (in minutes)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean time between sessions (in hours)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of time-on-task - time spent on video-lecture, quiz or forum pages</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Alterations | Interactive visualization | • | • | • |
| Planning ahead | • | • | • | • |
| Feedback framing | • | • | • | • |

Table 1: Overview of feedback metrics and alterations presented to learners in each MOOC. A • indicates the presence of the metric/alteration.

In each MOOC, the Feedback System was placed in the Weekly Introduction unit of each course week so that it would be readily available and immediately visible to learners upon entering the new course week, enabling them to reflect on their SRL behavior so far. With the exception of...
the Feedback System, all learners received the same course materials, independent of the experimental condition.

**Feedback metrics.**

Table 1 shows an overview of the feedback metrics given to learners in each MOOC. After each MOOC course week, the metrics were computed based on the log traces of all weeks prior. These metrics were chosen based on the following criteria: relevance to self-regulated learning, clarity/intuitiveness to the learner, and availability in the log data. For each metric, all values of previously successful learners were sorted and the top 5% and bottom 5% of values were discarded to remove outliers. The mean of the remaining values was computed, yielding a single value per metric — we consider this mean to be indicative of the tendency of the whole successful group of learners. We operationalize “sessions” as strings of activity with less than an hour gap between two events. As shown in Table 1, we adopted different feedback metrics in different MOOCs to explore the impact of the choice of metrics (H1.2 and H1.3).

**Feedback System Alterations.**

Apart from the different metrics, we also explored three refinements of the Feedback System:

1. Planning ahead: in WaterX the learners only received feedback about their behavior up to now and how it compares to that of successful learners. In this alteration (in UrbanX and BusinessX), we also provide the learner with a visualization of the role models’ behavior (labelled as “Average graduate this week” in Figure 1) in the upcoming week, enabling learners to plan ahead instead of only reflect.

2. Interactive visualization: instead of a static feedback image (as provided in WaterX), in this alteration, we provide learners with an interactive visualization they can explore, i.e. mouse over the metrics to reveal exact numbers and comparisons (cf. Figure 1), and toggle on/off the metrics of the average successful learner for the upcoming week.

3. Cultural feedback framing: in the first three MOOCs, the Feedback System provides no written interpretation of the visualization; instead learners are left to draw their own conclusions. In CalcX we additionally provide an explanatory text (as shown in Figure 1) that offers a clear interpretation of the learner’s “on-trackness”.

**4.3 Studies**

In each MOOC, we deployed a variation of the Feedback System. Table 1 summarizes the feedback metrics and variations deployed. For random assignment, we used a between-subjects design, where learners were assigned to either the control or a treatment condition and remained in this condition throughout the study. Table 1 shows a breakdown of the number of learners assigned to each condition for each MOOC. To gather baseline data from the first two weeks of each course, we released the Feedback System in the treatment conditions in course week 3/3 in each experiment. As noted before, the Feedback System is then updated on a weekly basis to reflect the updated learner activity data.

In the control condition across all experiments, learners did not receive the Feedback System. However, the edX platform offers a very basic form of learner feedback: a learner can visit her “progress” page and view the number of points scored so far in the course. This progress page is available to all learners, independent of their condition assignment. In the treatment condition, learners received the Feedback System in addition to edX’s progress page.

In all but one study there is only one treatment condition. In CalcX, we had two treatment conditions, one for each culture-specific framing of the explanatory feedback text:

- **CalcX treatment 1** received text with an individualistic-promotion-focused framing;
- **CalcX treatment 2** received text with a collectivist prevention-focused framing.

We determined each learner’s cultural context based on the IP address used to access the course relying on MaxMind’s GeoIP lookup database as not all learners self-report their nationality. For learners with more than one IP address used, we consider the first one they used to access the course as their country.

We developed a strong manipulation of the culture-specific framing by drawing on the cultural difference in (1) individualistic vs. collectivist appeals (collectivist cultures see

---

Table 1: Overview of the number of learners enrolled and assigned to the control and treatment groups respectively. The number of active learners (having spent at least 5 minutes in the course platform) is in the parentheses beneath.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WaterX</th>
<th>UrbanX</th>
<th>BusinessX</th>
<th>CalcX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>10,943</td>
<td>8,137</td>
<td>2,352</td>
<td>12,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>(3,220)</td>
<td>(1,062)</td>
<td>(499)</td>
<td>(3,415)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Group 1</td>
<td>5,460</td>
<td>4,038</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>4,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Group 2</td>
<td>(1,594)</td>
<td>(987)</td>
<td>(251)</td>
<td>(1,150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Group 3</td>
<td>(1,626)</td>
<td>(975)</td>
<td>(248)</td>
<td>(1,147)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Group 4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>(1,118)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Overview of the number of learners enrolled and assigned to the control and treatment groups respectively. The number of active learners (having spent at least 5 minutes in the course platform) is in the parentheses beneath.

---

Figure 1: The Feedback System as shown in CalcX, annotated for clarity.
the self embedded in a relational network, while the self-concept is more independent in individualist cultures), and (2) prevention- vs. promotion-focus (the prevention of negative outcomes is emphasized over the promotion of positive outcomes in collectivist cultures, and vice versa for individualist cultures) [13, 31, 34]. We designed two texts for each treatment group: one for learners who are “on track” (characterized by exhibiting similar behavior to that of the role model learners) and one for learners who are “behind” (characterized by exhibiting less course engagement compared to the role model learners). The texts (four overall) and how those texts align with a particular framing are shown in Table 3. The learners were evaluated as “on-track” or “behind” based on their on-trackness score, OT. The on-trackness score quantifies the similarity between a learner’s behavior and that of the previously successful learners: we normalize each metric to a value in the range [0, 10] (chosen for convenience to work well in the spider chart setup) and then compute the difference, di, between the learner’s score on metric mi and the previously successful learners’ average score on mi. If di ≤ −1 vi,m,i = {1, ..., 6} the learner is classified as behind, otherwise she is on-track — this is a very conservative classification, the learner has to have a lower engagement level on every single metric before she is considered as being behind.

The study design and all analyses conducted as part of the CalcX experiment were pre-registered through the Open Science Framework, vetted, and approved to meet the requirements of the Center for Open Science Preregistration Challenge. All manuscripts, data, and scripts used for analysis are available at: https://cos.io/ys6au

4.4 Measures & Method of Analysis

The key outcome variable we aimed to affect with the design of our Feedback System is course completion—a learner has passed and receives a certificate when she has earned the required minimum passing score based on the summative quiz questions. While individual student intentions may vary throughout the learner population, the achievement of earning a certificate is an appropriate outcome measure, as it demonstrates sustained commitment to the course and mastery over the course material.

Our second objective is the promotion of SRL and meta-cognitive awareness. While many SRL actions are meta-cognitive and unobservable, it has been shown that some can be inferred through a learner’s logged actions with the course materials [17, 23, 40, 41] such as: goal-setting & planning, time management, self-monitoring, and social comparison.

For non-binary measures, to test if differences between experimental conditions are statistically significant, we used the non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test, because these measures were not normally distributed and exhibited unequal variances across conditions. For binary measures, we tested differences in proportion using a χ² test. We present the results of each test by each group’s mean and median along with the χ² value, degrees of freedom, and level of statistical significance.

Due to the high attrition rates common to most MOOCs, (65%-74%) of learners never returned to the course after enrolling to one of our four MOOCs), the subsequent analyses only consider data generated by active learners. We define active learners as those having spent at least five minutes on the course platform. See Table 2 for the breakdown of registered vs. active learners per MOOC.

5. RESULTS

We present our findings for the Research Questions outlined in Section 4.1. Specifically, we discuss the impact of the Feedback System on course completion and engagement in Sections 5.1 & 5.2, heterogeneous treatment effects of the Feedback System in Section 5.3 and lastly in Section 5.4 we compare the effects for different cultural framings of the feedback.

5.1 Course Completion

We hypothesized that the Feedback System will increase learner achievement in terms of course completion (H1.1). Table 4 shows the completion rates in all conditions for the first three experiments. The completion rate is consistently higher in the treatment condition than in the control condition in all experiments. Pooling across experiments, we observed an increase in the completion rate from 15.5% to 18.9% (χ² = 5.87, p = 0.008). Thus, regarding hypothesis H1.1, we conclude:

The Feedback System significantly increases course completion rates in MOOCs.

In the fourth experiment, which tested two treatment conditions with different cultural framings against the control of not providing the Feedback System, we also observed higher completion rates in the treatment conditions (Table 5). However, this difference was not statistically significant (p > 0.25). However, the overall completion rate in the CalcX course was extremely low (1.7%). This suggests that the sample is drawn from a population of less committed learners and that potential effects could be obfuscated by high levels of unexplained variance in completion outcomes. Another contributing factor to this rift between CalcX and the other three courses is the fact that CalcX was self-paced (content released all-at-once), whereas the others were instructor-paced (content released weekly), thus providing less structure/support to the learners.

Moreover, we hypothesized that showing certain combinations of feedback metrics will better promote positive changes in behavior than others (H1.3). We explored this by changing the (combination of) metrics in each of the four iterations of the Feedback System (see Table 4). Given that the course completion rates increased across all four iterations each with a different combination of feedback metrics (with two of the six metrics—quiz submission timeliness (how far ahead of the deadline responses were submitted) and quiz questions attempted—were present in all four) we conclude:

Each combination of metrics shown to the learners produced significant increases in completion.

5.2 Engagement

In light of the positive effect of the Feedback System on course completion, we next evaluated specific changes in learner behavior corresponding to the behavioral metrics that were visualized in the Feedback System (H1.1). These metrics, which varied across experiments, were most likely
Table 3: Overview of the supplementary texts the treatment groups received in CalcX, depending on their performance in the course so far (either on track or behind). The alignment of the words and phrases with the intended framing is highlighted. Sentences prefixed by ↖ are directly addressed at the individual (individualistic framing). Best viewed in color.

Table 4: Course completion rates across the first three studies among the active learners. Overall, the difference in completion rate between the groups is statistically significant ($p = 0.008$).

Table 5: Course completion rates in the CalcX course among active learners. A binomial test of independent proportions revealed no statistically significant differences between the three conditions.

to be directly affected through social comparison. Table 6 shows the results of Kruskal-Wallis tests comparing the various feedback metrics between the treatment and control groups in study to test $H1.2$. A common thread across the three experiments was that of the Feedback System increasing the number of summative quiz questions that learners submitted, which directly promotes course completion.

Looking at each feedback metric individually in Table 6, we observe 15 out of 18 times an improvement from control to treatment condition ↖ three times no change is observed. A high "time between sessions" score is not better per se, but it indicates a desirable high-spacing learning routine to be successful.

Table 6: Results of the Kruskal-Wallis tests for the behavior metrics (feedback metrics) provided in the Feedback System for WaterX, UrbanX, and BusinessX. Statistically significant differences are in bold.

The treatment condition does not lead to a worse effect in any feedback metric. While only a handful of these differences are statistically significant, this consistency lends itself to some explanatory power over the statistically significant increases in course completion rates: while on an individual level, only some metrics show significant increases as a result of the Feedback System, on a macro level—that which accounts for a learner’s overall activity in the course—we infer that these small increases in engagement all effectively coalesce into a boost in desirable behavior that leads to increased completion rates.

Based on these results, we conclude:

The Feedback System effects desirable changes in learner engagement.

Table 7 shows the results of the same analysis on the engagement metrics across the three conditions in CalcX; the
Table 7: Results of the Kruskal-Wallis tests for CalcX. Statistically significant differences indicated in bold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Ctrl x</th>
<th>Treat.1 x</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Ctrl x</th>
<th>Treat.2 x</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Treat.1 x</th>
<th>Treat.2 x</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>avg. time/week (minutes)</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revisited lectures</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forum posts</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quiz questions attempted</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time on quizzes (%)</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>submission timeliness (days)</td>
<td>47.48</td>
<td>45.70</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>47.48</td>
<td>46.71</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>45.70</td>
<td>46.71</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Who did it Benefit?

Going beyond average treatment effects of the Feedback System, we now evaluate heterogeneous treatment effects, that is, we explore how the feedback affects different groups of learners (RQ2) according to their prior education level.

Partitioning by Prior Education: We next examined learner achievement in the context of learners’ prior education levels to investigate whether the Feedback System affected these groups differently. Tables 8 shows the results of this inquiry, in which we compare the average final grade earned across the first three three courses. For the CalcX course, on the other hand, we found no moderating effect of prior education on learners’ achievement in the context of learners’ prior education category to understand, (ii) highly educated learners are better able to synthesize the information offered by the Feedback System and translate it into positive behavior as they are already experienced learners (with at least some SRL skills), and/or (iii) lower educated learners are not concerned with obtaining a certificate, but rather focus on knowledge acquisition.

5.4 Framing Feedback to Cultural Contexts

In the CalcX course, we tested H3.1 and H3.2 about supplementing the Feedback System with culture-specific feedback. As before, we evaluated each hypothesis both in terms of learner achievement and engagement. All pre-registered analyses for this experiment are reported in Section 5.4.1. Additional exploratory analyses are reported in Sections 5.4.3 and 5.4.2.

5.4.1 Pre-registered: Completion & Engagement

To address H3.1, we conducted binomial tests of proportions to compare the completion rates of learners and Kruskal-Wallis Chi-Squared tests to compare the six different behavioural metrics in the control and treatment conditions while accounting for learners’ cultural context. We segmented learners into high, balanced, or low individualism and then compared the completion rates of learners from high and low individualism cultures in each condition (H3.1). There was no significant difference in completion rate between the control and either treatment condition in countries high on individualism and low on individualism (all p > 0.12). Likewise, we evaluated effects in different cultural contexts defined by the tightness index, also yielding no significant differences in completion (all p > 0.29). Finally, we evaluated if this experiment also yields a heterogeneous treatment effect by education level, as in the prior experiments (RQ2). We found no evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Prior Education</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Ctrl x</th>
<th>Treat.1 x</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WaterX</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>2,006</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UrbanX</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1,337</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BusinessX</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVR</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3,642</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1,318</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that education level moderates the effect of the Feedback System ($\chi^2 = 0.40, p = 0.82$). Overall, we thus conclude:

Supplementing the Feedback System with text invoking a learner’s cultural individualism or cultural tightness does not have an observable effect on their course achievement or engagement.

5.4.2 Increased “Active” Threshold

We suspected that the exceptionally low completion rate of CalcX caused much noise in the data from the high number of uncommitted learners. Where the WaterX, UrbanX, and BusinessX studies show a consistent main effect that the Feedback System increases course completion, this effect was not present in the CalcX results above. We therefore select a new sample by imposing a more strict threshold for considering a learner “active.” This sample only includes learners who were in the course platform for at least one hour per week on average, yielding a sample size of $n = 658$ learners who were in the course platform for at least one hour per week (between 6–8 hours), this is a very reasonable threshold.

With this new threshold imposed we find that the individualist framing condition increased completion rates regardless of a learner’s own cultural context from 12.8% in the control condition to 19.9%, a 7.1% increase ($t = 2.02, p = 0.04$). We therefore conclude:

The individualist framing condition was the most effective overall in increasing course completion rates.

We also find that the individualistic framing has a significant positive effect on the course completion rate of learners from countries with high cultural tightness, increasing from 12.1% in the control condition to 36.3% in the individualist condition (a 24.2% increase, $t = 2.07, p = 0.04$). We conclude:

The individualist framing condition was highly effective for learners of high cultural tightness in promoting course completion.

This finding is counter to what we would anticipate based on the literature, as tight cultures emphasize collectivism. But in the MOOC setting, it appears that individualistic framing resonates strongly with learners from highly tight cultural contexts.

5.4.3 The Cultural Tightness Phenomenon

The Kruskal-Wallis Chi-Squared tests used to compare the different conditions of CalcX also revealed a novel finding. Independent of the experimental condition, for every metric (cf Table 1), learners from countries of low cultural tightness exhibit significantly ($p \leq 0.001$) higher levels of achievement and engagement than learners from countries of high cultural tightness. Having made this observation for CalcX, we conducted the same analysis for the other three MOOCs and find the same significant differences leading us to conclude:

Learners from countries with low cultural tightness significantly outperform their peers from countries of high cultural tightness in terms of both engagement (all $p$-values $p \leq 0.1$) and achievement ($p \leq 0.02$).

This is likely caused by the nature of the MOOC learning experience. MOOCs accept endless possibilities for engagement and commitment levels; learners can come and go as they please at no cost. This aligns strongly with loose (low tightness) cultures, where there are few strongly-enforced rules and high tolerance for deviation. Traditional classroom environments with strict attendance and performance policies align more with the ideals of tight cultures, with lots of highly-enforced rules and low tolerance for deviation.

6. CONCLUSION

This research presents the results of four large-scale randomized controlled trial experiments in which we evaluated the effectiveness of presenting to learners a personalized Feedback System designed to encourage social comparison between learners and their successful peers.

We found that providing MOOC learners with a social comparison Feedback System designed to promote learners’ awareness of not only their own SRL and metacognitive processes, but those of their successful classmates leads to statistically significant increases in the course completion rate. Furthermore, we found that learners benefit from the Feedback System regardless of the (combination of) behavior metrics shown to them. While completion rate increases, we observed no indication that learners adapt their behavior specifically to the provided metrics.

In trying to gain a better understanding of what type of learners the Feedback System benefits the most, we found that the benefits of the Feedback System intervention are limited to learners who are already highly educated. While this is counter to the intention and promise of MOOCs to reach the uneducated and lift people out of poverty, it exposes and highlights a new challenge for MOOC researchers and designers: designing targeted interventions that benefit learners who are not already highly educated.

While the cultural framing interventions we evaluated in CalcX do not appear to have any significant effect on learner behavior, this line of inquiry also led to a novel finding. We discovered a statistically significant trend in the data that indicates learners from countries with low cultural tightness consistently outperform learners from countries with high cultural tightness in terms of course engagement levels and final grades earned.

With these findings in mind, future MOOC interventions should be personalized and support learners based on their prior education level and cultural context.

In future work, we will move from a fixed role model in our Feedback System to a set of different personas (e.g., high achievers vs. just-doing-enough) the learners can identify with as well as real-time feedback (instead of weekly updates). Lastly, we will evaluate new designs for supplementary feedback texts, such as the cultural framings described above, which are more prominent and thus more likely to affect the learners.
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