

SRLx

A Personalized Learner Interface for MOOCs

Davis, Daniel; Triglianios, Vasileios; Hauff, Claudia; Houben, Geert-Jan

DOI

[10.1007/978-3-319-98572-5_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-98572-5_10)

Publication date

2018

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Lifelong Technology-Enhanced Learning

Citation (APA)

Davis, D., Triglianios, V., Hauff, C., & Houben, G-J. (2018). SRLx: A Personalized Learner Interface for MOOCs. In V. Pammer-Schindler, M. Pérez-Sanagustín, H. Drachsler, R. Elferink, & M. Scheffel (Eds.), Lifelong Technology-Enhanced Learning: 13th European Conference on Technology Enhanced Learning, EC-TEL 2018 (pp. 122-135). (Lecture Notes in Computer Science ; Vol. 11082). Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-98572-5_10

Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable). Please check the document version above.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights. We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Green Open Access added to TU Delft Institutional Repository

'You share, we take care!' – Taverne project

<https://www.openaccess.nl/en/you-share-we-take-care>

Otherwise as indicated in the copyright section: the publisher is the copyright holder of this work and the author uses the Dutch legislation to make this work public.



SRLx: A Personalized Learner Interface for MOOCs

Dan Davis¹(✉), Vasileios Triglianios², Claudia Hauff¹, and Geert-Jan Houben¹

¹ Web Information Systems, Delft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands
{d.davis,c.hauff,g.j.p.m.houben}@tudelft.nl

² Faculty of Informatics, University of Lugano, Lugano, Switzerland
triglv@usi.ch

Abstract. Past research in large-scale learning environments has found one of the most inhibiting factors to learners' success to be their inability to effectively self-regulate their learning efforts. In traditional small-scale learning environments, personalized feedback (on progress, content, behavior, etc.) has been found to be an effective solution to this issue, but it has not yet widely been evaluated at scale. In this paper we present the **Personalized SRL Support System (SRLx)**, an interactive widget that we designed and open-sourced to improve learners' self-regulated learning behavior in the Massive Open Online Course platform edX. **SRLx** enables learners to plan their learning on a weekly basis and view real-time feedback on the realization of those plans. We deployed **SRLx** in a renewable energies MOOC to more than 2,900 active learners and performed an exploratory analysis on our learners' SRL behavior.

Keywords: Learner modeling · Self-regulated learning
Personalized learning

1 Introduction

Large-scale learning environments open up world-class educational resources to the masses. With this unprecedented scale and reach, however, come new challenges in enabling learners of diverse backgrounds to excel given the unfamiliar context of the massive online classroom. Low course completion rates—dropout rates of 95% are not uncommon [17]—highlight the need for additional support in MOOCs. Past research in this space, e.g. [12, 14, 15, 25] has explored the problems learners face when trying to succeed in these self-directed learning environments. Learners are often unable to find the time to keep up with a course, an issue related to insufficient self-regulatory abilities [12, 25]. *Self-regulated learning* (SRL) is the ability to plan, monitor, and actively control one's learning process. The discipline to plan and follow a self-imposed studying regime is a skill that is learned over time and associated with a higher likelihood of achieving self-set

D. Davis—The author's research is supported by the *Leiden-Delft-Erasmus Centre for Education and Learning*.

course goals in MOOCs [13,19]. Learners who were exposed to such training during their studies tend to be more successful in MOOCs than learners without a tertiary education background. The latter though is a target population that is vital to keep the original vision of MOOCs alive: making higher education accessible to those that do not enter the traditional tertiary education system. Learners need tools that enable them to learn *how* to learn.

Today’s MOOC platforms (such as Coursera and edX) are not designed in a way that encourages learners to explicitly plan or monitor (with the help of feedback) their learning activities [7]. In general, learners are exposed to very few feedback moments to support their SRL processes.

Yeomans and Reich [24] found that a single planning prompt at the start of a MOOC can positively influence learning outcomes. We have expanded upon this concept by designing and developing the **Personalized SRL Support System**¹ (SRLx), an interactive widget for the edX platform that allows learners to explicitly express their motivation, *plan* their learning, *monitor* their progress towards their set goals at any point in time, and *reflect* on them. SRLx’s design was based on educational theories and findings in the SRL literature.

We deployed SRLx in a MOOC on renewable energies offered by the Delft University of Technology in 2017 with more than 2,900 active learners and empirically evaluate the following research questions:

- RQ1** To what extent do MOOC learners adopt and take advantage of a personalized SRL support tool?
- RQ2** Does SRLx support MOOC learners in promoting effective self-regulated learning behavior?

Along with the contribution of an open-sourced system architecture that provides SRL support at scale, we present the following key findings from our analysis of learners’ SRL behaviors:

- As the course progresses, learners are able to plan their time commitment more effectively.
- Learners are more conservative with the way they plan to commit time to the course compared to video and quiz activity planning.

2 Related Work

Zimmerman et al.’s model of self-regulated learning [27] comprises three cyclical phases: forethought, performance, and self-reflection. Learners first formulate a plan for their learning activities, they then carry out and act according to their plan, and finally they look back at their behavior and examine their strengths and areas for improvement. In this section we first examine self-regulated learning research in the classroom and then delve into SRL studies conducted within MOOCs.

¹ Open-sourced at <https://github.com/dan7davis/Lambda>.

Self-regulated Learning in the Classroom. Goal setting has been shown to be an important factor across all levels of education. Past research has investigated to what extent aspects such as *who* sets the goals, *when* are they set, *what* goals are set and *why* are those set influence the effectiveness of goal setting. While these studies have been conducted across a range of education levels, they have all taken place in the traditional classroom or lab setting.

Schippers et al. [23] showed that engaging and teaching undergraduate students about goal setting at the beginning of their studies has a positive impact across a prolonged period of time—after one year, a 98% reduction in the gender achievement gap and a 38% reduction in the ethnicity achievement gap was observed compared to the previous year’s cohort of students.

At the secondary education level, Zimmerman et al. [26] found that social-studies class students perform better (as measured by their final grade) when they set their own goals and benchmarks, than when having those imposed on them by teachers. Regularly reviewing and reflecting upon one’s study goals and behaviors was found by Sagotsky et al. [22] to be significantly more effective in terms of grades and study behavior than just setting goals in a user study with primary and middle school students. A similar result was found by Mahoney et al. [20] among 27 undergraduate students who were assigned to one of three experimental conditions while preparing for an exam: (i) continuous self-monitoring, (ii) intermittent self-monitoring, and (iii) receiving instructor feedback. In line with [22], students who performed self-monitoring exhibited higher levels of engagement and achievement than students who did not.

Self-regulated Learning in MOOCs. Due to the massive nature of MOOC platforms (supporting millions of learners), a large part of the platform development effort has to be spent on continued scalability. This leaves little time and attention for advances in platforms’ instructional designs. Prior research in the MOOC setting has so far focused on learner surveys (to elicit their SRL needs), pre-course SRL interventions, MOOC forum interventions, and the notion of learner feedback [4].

Nawrot and Doucet [21] and Hood et al. [9] surveyed MOOC learners about their experiences taking MOOCs. Proper time management was found to be a major hindrance for many MOOC learners [21]. The ability to self-regulate one’s learning was found to vary depending on learners’ professional backgrounds: higher-educated learners are better able to regulate their learning (including time management) than lower-educated learners [9].

Providing learners with visualizations of their progress enables them to *reflect* upon their learning, and an emerging body of research has begun to empirically evaluate the effectiveness of such feedback [1, 2, 6, 10]. Over time, this reflection should improve learners’ use of SRL strategies [3, 8]. One interesting finding by Kulkarni et al. [18] pertains to the timeliness of feedback and its impact on MOOC learners’ final grades: feedback (in this case on in-progress assignments) received within 24 h after assignment submission improves learning outcomes; if the feedback is delayed beyond this point, learners do not benefit from it.

According to Davis et al. [6], enabling learners to reflect weekly on their learning behavior in comparison to that of their successful peers (i.e. feedback through social comparison) led to a significant increase in passing rates among learners with high levels of prior education (Bachelor degree or higher). A drawback of this work is the need for a successful cohort to compare against and the fact that learners cannot establish their own plans and goals.

Conclusions. Goal setting and feedback are important techniques to improve learning outcomes in the traditional classroom. In the MOOC setting, SRL interventions have so far either been restricted to pre-course interventions or feedback. We here investigate the effect of regular planning and goal setting in the MOOC setting.

3 System Overview

We now first describe the client-side and server-side components of SRLx which allow for *real-time event tracking* and then turn to the design rationales behind the four front-end interfaces we developed (cf. Fig. 1).

Client-Side. The edX platform—on which we deployed SRLx—allows course designers to embed and execute custom HTML, CSS, and JavaScript code in edX pages, thus enabling the creation of customized interfaces and programming logic. We take advantage of this affordance and embed our client-side code in edX’s RAW HTML input elements.

We implemented two functionalities on the client-side: (i) the tracking and persisting of learners’ activities to the back-end such as quiz question submissions and video watch events (cf. Sect. 4 for an exhaustive list) via AJAX and (ii) the displaying of our front-ends for goal setting, planning & feedback and the persisting of learners’ interactions with them. We describe the activity tracking below and describe the interfaces in more detail at the end of this section.

Activity Tracking. As SRLx provides real-time feedback based on learners’ actions on the edX platform, we had to track events such as quiz submissions and video watching events in real-time. The real-time constraint meant that we could not make use of edX’s default log data setup which distributes a MOOC’s daily logs in 24 h intervals. We therefore had to track these events ourselves as follows.

edX course components, such as videos or quizzes, are implemented via XBlocks, a component architecture based on Python, HTML, JavaScript and CSS. This allows anyone to create standalone hierarchical components that may include other XBlocks. To capture user interactions, Xblocks emit and subscribe to events using an event tracking library². We enable real-time event tracking by using edX’s `Logger` object to subscribe to emitted events using the `listen(eventType, element, callback)` method: all Xblock fragments make

² <https://github.com/edx/event-tracking>.

use of the `Logger` object to emit events which are subsequently sent to the edX back-end via an `XMLHttpRequest`. We listen to all events of interest and forward those to our back-end.

Back-End. To store and retrieve learner data in real-time, we implemented an HTTPS server in Node.js and persisted the tracked events in a MongoDB database. The server uses a RESTful API to store and retrieve learner events. It supports the JSON format for both requests and responses. Along with logging edX’s learner behavior data, the SRLx server also logs all learner interactions with the SRLx interfaces.




Fig. 1. The four SRLx interfaces as they appear to learners on the edX platform: **motivation expression** (top-left), **motivation feedback** (top-right), **plan formulation** (bottom-left), and **plan feedback** (bottom-right).

Front-End. The three phases of Zimmerman’s model of self-regulated learning [27] (forethought, performance, and self-reflection) are integral to the design of SRLx’s four learner-facing interfaces shown in Fig. 1: motivation expression (forethought), motivation feedback (self-reflection), plan formulation (forethought), and plan feedback (performance and self-reflection). We now discuss them in turn.

Motivation Expression. This interface allows us to gain an understanding of learners’ motivations and overall forethought for their attitude towards the course. Modeled after the study planning system evaluated in [23], it is shown on the top-left of Fig. 1 and prompts learners to write about their motivation

and what brought them to the course in the first place. The key question asked to learners is *What drives you?* followed by other prompting questions to help learners express themselves: *What brought you here?* and *What do you hope to gain from this course?* Once learners have submitted their motivation it is persisted to our back-end. Learners can view and change their response any time.

Motivation Expression Feedback. In order to provide feedback and encourage a habit of self-reflection, we regularly make learners aware of their latest motivation response by displaying it back to them (top-right of Fig. 1) throughout each course week/unit. The response is shown as a quotation by the learner underneath the *What drives you:* text together with the learner’s edX username (to emphasize once more the source of the quotation).

Plan Formulation. This interface (Fig. 1 bottom-left) promotes forethought in prompting learners to formulate and state their plan for the coming course week in terms of engagement with course resources. Specifically, learners are prompted to enter the number of videos they intend to watch, quiz questions they intend to answer, and hours they intend to devote to the course this week. To aid learners in their planning, we provide the total number of videos and quizzes of the week (automatically extracted from the edX course pages) as well as the recommended time to spend in the course that week (as estimated by the course instructors).

Plan Feedback. To promote awareness learners’ performance and encourage self-reflection, the planning feedback interface (Fig. 1 bottom-right) consists of three gauges showing learners how well they have progressed towards the goals *they set for themselves*, removing all instructor influence. We designed the plan feedback as a data visualization dashboard that allows learners to easily draw their own insights about their progress. Previous research in data visualization for MOOC learners found that more abstract feedback (such as the “timeliness” of the quiz submissions) only benefited learners with a higher education background [6]. Since highly educated learners already have SRL abilities, we aimed to engage those learners that lack self-regulation skills and designed the interface to be clear and straight-forward to interpret.

4 Study Setup

Participants. We deployed SRLx in an edX MOOC on renewable energies offered by the Delft University of Technology. The course consists of 75 individual lecture videos and 295 graded quiz questions. A total of 8,057 learners enrolled in the course. The course started on August 29, 2017 and concluded on November 8, 2017. We made SRLx available to all learners but did not provide any additional incentive for using it.

Before the course, the learners were asked to self-report their basic demographic information. 5,349 learners at least partially complied. Of these learners, 25.3% are female; the learners’ median age is 26. We also collected information about their prior education level, as this has shown to have a significant

impact on learning outcomes and engagement with MOOCs [6]. As is common in MOOCs, we observe a great variety in this respect with learners running the gamut from high school to PhD levels of prior education: 1% had no prior formal education, 20% held at least a high school diploma, 5% an Associate’s degree, 45% a Bachelor’s degree, 26% a Master’s degree, and 3% a PhD. We consider learners’ prior education level to be *high* when they have earned at least a Bachelor’s degree, and *low* when they have not.

Given that many learners who enroll in a MOOC never enter the platform and log a session (a common occurrence in MOOCs), we narrow down the sample for analysis accordingly. Among all learners enrolled, 2,961 entered the course at least once and are therefore considered as *active learners* in our analyses.

Measures. To evaluate the role that SRLx plays in learners’ achievement and course engagement, we measure a number of in-course learning behaviors that are commonly used in MOOC studies as well as a number of novel measures enabled by SRLx:

- Average quiz score $\in [0, 1]$ (proportion of attempted quiz questions answered correctly);
- Course activities:
 - Number of video interactions (play, pause, fast-forward, rewind, scrub);
 - Number of quiz submissions (submissions, correctness);
 - Number of discussion forum posts;
 - Time spent in the course;
- SRLx interactions:
 - Plan formulation (number of videos & quizzes and hours planned to spend in the course that week);
 - Motivation expression (submission text);
 - Editing (changing an established motivation or plan).

5 Results

In this section we analyze the deployment of SRLx along four lines: (i) course-level learning behaviors, (ii) study plan formulation tendencies, (iii) plan achievement rates, and (iv) motivations expressed over time.

5.1 Course-Level Learning Behaviours

In Table 1 we present summary statistics for overall course behavior among all active learners, characterized by having logged at least one session in the course. Table 2 shows the number of submissions made via SRLx.

Of the 2,961 active learners in the course, 872 (32%) engaged with SRLx at least one time (answering **RQ1**)—here characterized by having formulated at least one plan *or* submitting at least one motivation expression. While this rate of minimal engagement is substantially higher than past studies, e.g. [5], the true

Table 1. Overview of the average behavior of active learners. In rows 2 & 3 we partition the set of active learners into *Comply* (learners who formulated at least one plan and submitted at least one motivation expression) and *Non-Comply* (the remainder) learners.

| Subset | N | Quiz Score | Session Count | SRLx Interact. | Feedback Checks | Quiz Submits | Videos Watched |
|------------|-------|------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------|----------------|
| Active | 2,961 | 0.41 | 32.57 | 152.72 | 3.63 | 43.11 | 8.33 |
| Comply | 303 | 0.72 | 66.48 | 348.93 | 7.31 | 91.56 | 16.31 |
| Non-Comply | 2,658 | 0.37 | 28.71 | 130.35 | 3.21 | 37.58 | 7.42 |

rate of compliance (submitting *both* a plan and a motivation) is still very low, at 10% (303 out of 2,961 active learners).

While the top row in Table 1 represents all active learners in the course, the bottom two rows show the impact of self-selection in highlighting the difference in behavior between learners who did and did not engage with SRLx: on average, learners using SRLx (i.e. our Comply group) log more than twice as many sessions, answer nearly three times as many quizzes, answer more questions correctly and watch more than twice as many videos compared to learners in the Non-Comply group. We cannot claim that this difference is caused by the use of SRLx; rather it is at least partially a result of the self-selection of learners who would have been highly engaged and more successful in the course regardless.

However, this trend could also be partially explained by prior research on the *doer effect*, or the “...association between the number of online interactive practice activities students do and their learning outcomes” [16]. This theory states that engagement with interactive course components (such as SRLx, discussion fora, or quiz questions) has a stronger learning effect than passive activities such as reading or watching lecture videos. So while SRLx is unlikely to be the sole cause of the increase in activity between compliers and non-compliers, theory states that it likely contributed, at least in part, to the more positive learning outcomes of those who engaged with it.

When we split the engagement between the different types of interfaces (Table 2), we find that the plan formulation interface was considerably more engaging, with more than twice as many learners formulating plans (on average two plan formulations per learner) than writing up their motivation.

Table 2. Number of submissions of motivation expressions, plan formulations, and plan/expression edits. The bottom row shows the number of unique learners to have completed each action type.

| | Motivation Expression | Plan Formulation | Edited |
|--------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------|
| #Submissions | 679 | 1,997 | 748 |
| #Learners | 396 | 971 | 338 |

5.2 Study Plan Formulation

In this analysis we focus on the plans the learners made using SRLx and thus address **RQ2**. We explore the following questions: are the learners overly ambitious with their plan formulation? Are learners able to consistently stick to their plans? Do their planning tendencies/strategies change over time? Figure 2 shows an aggregate view of all 1,997 plans submitted in the course.

Figure 2 (top left) shows the study planning behavior (in terms of time commitment, quiz submissions, and videos watched) of all learners who formulated and submitted at least one plan in SRLx. We find that the majority of plans set were for the maximum given the week’s content, i.e. most learners who submitted plans aimed at completing all quizzes, watching all videos and spending the instructor-suggested time on the course platform. At the same time in Fig. 2 (top left) we observe that the goals set pertaining to the proportion of time (from the recommended six hours per week) learners plan to commit to the course




Fig. 2. In clock-wise order: (i) the proportion of learners’ formulated plans set for the maximum possible value in the respective course week; (ii) the proportion of the maximum plan set by learners of each activity type over the span of all course weeks; (iii) plan achievement rates for each activity type by course week. Error bars show the standard error.

is lower than that of quiz submissions and videos. A Wilcoxon rank sum test with continuity correction ($W = 2,210,200$, $p < 0.0001$) indicates a significant difference between time plans ($\bar{x} = 0.838$, $\sigma = 0.34$) and video plans ($\bar{x} = 0.88$, $\sigma = 0.29$). From this analysis we conclude that learners are more conservative with the way they plan their time commitment to the course than the way they plan to engage with course materials.

To examine planning behavior at a more detailed level, in Fig. 2 (top right) we segment planning behavior by course week and illustrate the change over time. Compared to the rather steady rate of ambition (proportion of maximum plan set) with quiz plans (overall mean of 84.7% of the maximum), learners exhibited an overall trend of increasing their ambition each week for time- and video-related plans—a 9 % point increase from Week 1 to Week 6 for time plans (mean of 80% to 89%) and a 5 % point increase for video plans (mean of 85% to 90%). While these two increases can be attributed to less-ambitious learners dropping out of the course, the lower rate for quiz-related plans still holds throughout the entire course.

5.3 Plan Achievement

Figure 2 (bottom) shows the rate at which learners achieve each aspect of their plans each course week (**RQ2**). Whereas in the previous section we discussed how learners are conservative with their plan formulations as it pertains to time, we see in Fig. 2 (bottom) that learners are strong at achieving their plans for time commitment and video lecture viewing with high consistency across course weeks—an important insight given that poor time management has been identified by prior research [12, 13, 21, 25] as one of the primary causes of attrition in MOOCs.

It is also worth noting that the consistency and success of learners' time planning achievement is not a product of less ambitious goals being set. Refer back to Fig. 2 (top right) to see that the opposite is actually true; learners become *more* ambitious with their time plans as the course progresses, and learners are still able to achieve their plans with high consistency.

For the learners' video watching plan achievement, we observe a slight increase across the weeks with an overall mean of 63% completion. For learners' achievement of their quiz question-related plans, we observe substantially lower completion rates than those regarding time—falling from 19% in Week 1 to a mere 9% in Week 6.

We hypothesize that these results on plan achievement are a product of the difficulty of each activity type. Though not trivial, spending time in the platform requires little more than a learner's presence. Slightly more demanding is the activity type of watching lecture videos; and most challenging of all three is answering quiz questions, which is not only dependent on the previous two activities but also requires the application of newly-acquired knowledge. In other words, the rate by which learners complete their plans is commensurate with the exigency of the respective activity type.

As previous research on MOOC learners has identified achievement gaps among learners [11], we next conducted an exploratory analysis on plan completion per activity type as a function of a learner’s prior education level (with *high* education learners having earned at least a Bachelors degree, accounting for 75% of learners in the course). We observe no significant difference in plan completion rates in any of the three activity types according to a Wilcoxon rank sum test with continuity correction, thus indicating that learners are able to effectively use SRLx across a wide range of ability levels. This suggests that SRLx is equally usable and effective for learners of all prior education levels.

5.4 Motivation Expression

Finally, we also conducted a preliminary analysis of the motivation texts our learners submitted. Among the 2,961 learners exposed to the SRLx interface, 396 submitted at least one motivation expression. These motivations range from learners working towards having better career opportunities to changing the world—the latter theme became markedly more prominent as the course progressed. The average word count is 23.9 (median 15, minimum 1, maximum 329). In Table 3 we randomly picked examples of *short* (at most ten words), *medium* length (up to 25 words) and *long* (26 words or more) submissions.

Table 3. Random sample of short, medium, and long submissions through the Motivation Expression interface.

| | |
|----|--|
| S1 | <i>Build up on sustainable energy knowledge</i> |
| S2 | <i>I expect to get to know the future of energy</i> |
| M1 | <i>I hope to learn more about sustainable ways of using and obtaining energy</i> |
| M2 | <i>I want a clean planet I want to be responsible for that</i> |
| L1 | <i>As a junior architect I am interested in learning more about the relationship between energy use and building design and how intelligent design can have positive impacts on building energy use as well as occupant health and happiness</i> |

Replicating the methods in [24] applied to MOOC learner texts on course intentions, we evaluated the predictive value of the length of a learner’s text submission on their (i) current grade, (ii) average quiz question score, and (iii) total time spent in the course platform and were not able to find a significant effect in any of the metrics.

The ten most frequent terms occurring among all motivations are (in descending order): *energy*, *renewable*, *sustainable*, *knowledge*, *learn*, *future*, *course*, *hope*, *better* and *sources*. These terms speak to the motivation of many learners to use the knowledge to improve the world; interestingly, no job related term appears in this list (the term *career* occurs at rank 20), indicating that many of our

learners have an intrinsic, rather than an extrinsic motivation. They are brought to the course and engage with the materials not out of need for career change or certification (as was commonly observed among MOOC learners in previous work [15]), but rather out of a desire to be able to spark positive change in the world. Given the topic of the course and its relevance to the issues facing society today, this certainly affects learner motivation in some sense, but this also demonstrates that MOOCs can be instrumental to shaping the next generation of emerging technologies in making the subject matter accessible to the masses.

6 Discussion

Based on the existing literature and theory on self-regulated learning, we designed SRLx to encourage and support learners in adopting effective self-regulated learning habits in MOOCs. SRLx enables learners express their (changing) motivation and to set their own goals and track their progress towards them in real-time instead of following instructor-prescribed goals.

To evaluate the efficacy of SRLx we deployed it in a MOOC with more than 2,900 active learners to observe to what extent and how learners engage with it. Despite the inconsistencies we observed based on previous related work, learner interactions with SRLx offer novel insights about the role of motivation expression and plan formulation for MOOC learners. We find (i) that as the course progresses, learners are able to plan their time commitment more effectively, (ii) a strong trend of intrinsic motivation shared by learners with the motivation expression interface, and (iii) learners are most conservative with the way they plan to commit time to the course compared to video and quiz activity planning.

Given our findings on the progression of learner's planning strategies over time with SRLx, we are able to offer an explanation of the findings by Yeomans and Reich [24] who found that plans that were formulated about time were less likely to succeed: that intervention took place at the beginning of a course, where learners formulated time plans over the long-term—requiring the foresight of many weeks in the future; SRLx, on the other hand, allows learners to set a new plan at the beginning of each course week (short- to medium-term). Combined with our evidence that learners become more effective at plan formulation over the span of the course, we conclude that time-specific plans are likely only to be ineffective when on a long-term scale; and when used on a short- to medium-term scale, they can be effective and attainable.

Future research should implement SRLx as a randomized controlled trial, or A/B test, in MOOCs to explore questions of causality—does SRLx directly cause learners to learn and engage more? Finally, SRLx, as presented here, is completely individualistic—learners only receive feedback on their own plan formulations and motivation expressions. By making SRLx social, or showing learners the planning behavior and performance of their peers as well as their own, this could present a promising way to leverage the scale of MOOCs and improve learner performance through increased social presence.

References

1. Bodily, R., Verbert, K.: Review of research on student-facing learning analytics dashboards and educational recommender systems. *IEEE Trans. Learn. Technol.* **10**(4), 405–418 (2017)
2. Bodily, R., Verbert, K.: Trends and issues in student-facing learning analytics reporting systems research. In: *LAK 2017*, pp. 309–318 (2017)
3. Bull, S., Kay, J.: Open learner models as drivers for metacognitive processes. In: Azevedo, R., Alevan, V. (eds.) *International Handbook of Metacognition and Learning Technologies*. SIHE, vol. 28, pp. 349–365. Springer, New York (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-5546-3.23>
4. Davis, D., Chen, G., Hauff, C., Houben, G.-J.: Activating learning at scale: a review of innovations in online learning strategies. *Comput. Educ.* **125**, 327–344 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2018.05.019>
5. Davis, D., Chen, G., van der Zee, T., Hauff, C., Houben, G.-J.: Retrieval practice and study planning in MOOCs: exploring classroom-based self-regulated learning strategies at scale. In: Verbert, K., Sharples, M., Kloboučar, T. (eds.) *EC-TEL 2016*. LNCS, vol. 9891, pp. 57–71. Springer, Cham (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-45153-4.5>
6. Davis, D., Jivet, I., Kizilcec, R.F., Chen, G., Hauff, C., Houben, G.J.: Follow the successful crowd: raising MOOC completion rates through social comparison at scale. In: *LAK 2017*, pp. 454–463 (2017)
7. Gregori, E.B., Zhang, J., Galván-Fernández, C., de Asís Fernández-Navarro, F.: Learner support in moocs: identifying variables linked to completion. *Comput. Educ.* **122**, 153–168 (2018)
8. Guerra, J., Hosseini, R., Somyurek, S., Brusilovsky, P.: An intelligent interface for learning content: combining an open learner model and social comparison to support self-regulated learning and engagement. In: *IUI 2016*, pp. 152–163 (2016)
9. Hood, N., Littlejohn, A., Milligan, C.: Context counts: how learners’ contexts influence learning in a MOOC. *Comput. Educ.* **91**, 83–91 (2015)
10. Jivet, I., Scheffel, M., Drachler, H., Specht, M.: Awareness is not enough: pitfalls of learning analytics dashboards in the educational practice. In: Lavoué, É., Drachler, H., Verbert, K., Broisin, J., Pérez-Sanagustín, M. (eds.) *EC-TEL 2017*. LNCS, vol. 10474, pp. 82–96. Springer, Cham (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-66610-5.7>
11. Kizilcec, R.F., Davis, G.M., Cohen, G.L.: Towards equal opportunities in MOOCs: affirmation reduces gender & social-class achievement gaps in china. In: *L@S 2017*, pp. 121–130 (2017)
12. Kizilcec, R.F., Halawa, S.: Attrition and achievement gaps in online learning. In: *L@S 2015*, pp. 57–66 (2015)
13. Kizilcec, R.F., Pérez-Sanagustín, M., Maldonado, J.J.: Self-regulated learning strategies predict learner behavior and goal attainment in massive open online courses. *Comput. Educ.* **104**, 18–33 (2017)
14. Kizilcec, R.F., Piech, C., Schneider, E.: Deconstructing disengagement: analyzing learner subpopulations in massive open online courses. In: *LAK 2013*, pp. 170–179. ACM (2013)
15. Kizilcec, R.F., Schneider, E.: Motivation as a lens to understand online learners: toward data-driven design with the olei scale. *ACM Trans. Comput. Hum. Interact. (TOCHI)* **22**(2), 6 (2015)

16. Koedinger, K.R., McLaughlin, E.A., Jia, J.Z., Bier, N.L.: Is the doer effect a causal relationship?: How can we tell and why it's important. In: LAK 2016, pp. 388–397 (2016)
17. Koller, D., Ng, A., Do, C., Chen, Z.: Retention and intention in massive open online courses. *Educause Rev.* **48**(3), 62–63 (2013)
18. Kulkarni, C.E., Bernstein, M.S., Klemmer, S.R.: Peerstudio: rapid peer feedback emphasizes revision and improves performance. In: L@S 2015, pp. 75–84 (2015)
19. Littlejohn, A., Hood, N., Milligan, C., Mustain, P.: Learning in MOOCs: motivations and self-regulated learning in MOOCs. *Internet High. Educ.* **29**, 40–48 (2016)
20. Mahoney, M.J., Moore, B.S., Wade, T.C., Moura, N.G.: Effects of continuous and intermittent self-monitoring on academic behavior. *J. Consult. Clin. Psychol.* **41**(1), 65 (1973)
21. Nawrot, I., Doucet, A.: Building engagement for MOOC students: introducing support for time management on online learning platforms. In: WWW 2014, pp. 1077–1082 (2014)
22. Sagotsky, G., Patterson, C.J., Lepper, M.R.: Training children's self-control: a field experiment in self-monitoring and goal-setting in the classroom. *J. Exp. Child Psychol.* **25**(2), 242–253 (1978)
23. Schippers, M.C., Scheepers, A.W., Peterson, J.B.: A scalable goal-setting intervention closes both the gender and ethnic minority achievement gap. *Palgrave Commun.* **1**, 15014 (2015)
24. Yeomans, M., Reich, J.: Planning prompts increase and forecast course completion in massive open online courses. In: LAK 2017, pp. 464–473 (2017)
25. Zheng, S., Rosson, M.B., Shih, P.C., Carroll, J.M.: Understanding student motivation, behaviors and perceptions in MOOCs. In: CSCW 2015, pp. 1882–1895 (2015)
26. Zimmerman, B.J., Bandura, A., Martinez-Pons, M.: Self-motivation for academic attainment: the role of self-efficacy beliefs and personal goal setting. *Am. Educ. Res. J.* **29**(3), 663–676 (1992)
27. Zimmerman, B.J., et al.: A social cognitive view of self-regulated academic learning. *J. Educ. Psychol.* **81**(3), 329–339 (1989)