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The Short ‘Story’ of MOOCs

• The MOOC is born (2008) University of Manitoba 2,200 students v 24 faculty based
• The MOOC explodes (2012) The year of the MOOC Kesim and Altinpulluk (2015), Christensen et al., 2013
• Characterised by polarisation: traditional v digital. Revolution according to Waldrop (2013)
• The social equaliser. Daradoumis, et al. (2013)
• The industry. Big business. Christensen et al., 2013
• Scale. (Sonwalker, 2013, 22).
• Schismatic architectures: x =behaviourist (controlled learning), c= connectivist/constructivist (learner freedom). Who is winning?
• The hybrid. Purpose placed first
• Massive. 100,000 is achievable
• Open. Global reach
• Structured. Ross et al. (2014)
• Attrition and feedback. Kesim & Altinpulluk, 2015, 18; Rivard, 2013)
• Changes. (Papathoma et al., 2015)
• Conversion to SPOC and COOC
Architecture

• Three week course
• Three/four ‘activities’ each week
• Six steps in each activity
• Eight hours per week for the student
• Asynchronous
• No synchronous activity
• Cohort. Global with over 35,000 on the first run. The largest course ever run at Glasgow University
Our Little MOOC ‘Story’

• Three design architects/‘educators’: me, Viktoria Nikolova (UG), and Rille Raaper (then PhD student)
• Three issues: content creation, presentation, working within the medium
• Futurelean platform used. Others include, Coursera, edX, Udacity, Udemy, Khan Academy, and Venture Lab
• Me: overall design and content construction
• Viktoria: coding, writing content under guidance, and uploading
• Rille: content writing and underpinning research to inform the design
Methodology

The methodology deployed was a reflective, multi-perspective, qualitative study using the written vignettes of the MOOC design team applied to Braun and Clarke’s (2006) method of inductive thematic analysis whose broad stages are detailed below:

• Data familiarisation
• Generating themes
• Sorting themes
• Relating themes
• Written mode
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Tutor 1</th>
<th>Tutor 2</th>
<th>Tutor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bureaucracy</td>
<td>Pedagogy v business</td>
<td>Technical limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unexpected tales</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>End vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Technical expertise</td>
<td>Formatting/coding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback

• Excellent
• Outstanding
• Brilliant
• I’d never have thought of that
• QR Code. You’re kidding!
• This course just keeps getting better

My favourite
• My ambition is to be a doctor and I really think that this course will help me to achieve that goal. Thank you Viktoria and Willie.

(13 year old boy from Somalia)
Polarities

- X→C hybridising
- Platform bureaucracy
- Time
- New v old
- Outward v inward looking philosophies
Paradoxes

- Brand vs. Learning
- Profit vs. Education
- Massive → Small
- Open → Private
- MOOC → SPOC/COOC
- Time
- Unexpectedness
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