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Abstract

In recent years, the number of online courses known as massive open online courses (MOOC) has increased significantly. Such courses are available on online providers’ sites, such as edX and Coursera. As a result, there is a notable reduction of clarity in terms of various course offerings, and this causes a need to change the MOOC description schemes to help inform potential applicants.

The article is aimed at identifying the capabilities of customer-oriented MOOC aggregators and the prospects for their further improvement.

The article presents approaches to the concept of customer focus, based on which the definition of a customer-oriented aggregator is formulated. The article analyses course descriptions used by MOOC providers and aggregators for their potential students. Based on this analysis, the authors develop a set of categories describing MOOC, used for the creation of a new MOOC description according to the customer-oriented criteria.
The authors conclude that the optimal descriptive MOOC scheme on the MOOC aggregator should satisfy both the academic environment and the customer-oriented criteria that correspond to students’ interests when choosing a MOOC.
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**Introduction**

Due to the rapid development of information technology and the introduction of a huge number of personal computers and mobile devices, there is a change in the traditional model of the education system and teaching and learning methods. Distance education technologies and the use of digital educational content contribute to the expansion of access to education and improve its quality in terms of the higher education system (Kabanov et al., 2020; Dudin, Bezbakh, Frolova & Galkina, 2018; Dudin et al., 2019).

Over the past decades, online education has become more important. Massive open online courses (MOOC) represent one of the developments in this field, since the courses of different institutions, including elite universities, become open and available for free from anywhere in the world. These courses are aimed at attracting a large number of participants, who tend to organize themselves according to their skills, goals, knowledge background, and common interests.

MOOC providers offer courses of the same curriculum and content. The user is spoiled for the choice of online courses, as there is a slight difference between various providers’ courses. The user needs to examine multiple providers and their websites and look through all their courses. Besides, users often want to study a specific topic within a particular area. In this case, it becomes increasingly difficult for the user to analyse and compare the curricula of all courses offered by various providers before choosing one of the educational services.

While MOOC platforms and courses themselves have become widespread, research has shown that the ambition to expand education accessibility has yet to be realized. Despite the massive education potential, MOOC participants are usually people with higher education experience (Cannell & Macintyre, 2014) (Chauhan, 2014). This expands access for advanced learners, but it does not expand participation for those who currently are far from education (Lane, Caird & Weller, 2014). According to the 2013 survey of Coursera
students, in many countries, almost 80% of MOOC students come from the rich and well-educated 6% of the population (Emanuel, 2013).

Despite the wide range of courses, the main challenge of online education is the low percentage of students who complete a course. According to some researchers, the average completion rate is only 12.6% (Jordan, 2015). To some extent, this figure can be explained by the goals of the enrolling people. They may save an interesting source, try learning on the Internet, learn more about a particular university, etc. However, these arguments partially explain the dropout rate, but not fully.

Moreover, students end neither paid nor free courses. The completion rate for paid courses does not differ completely from that for free courses. At the same time, E. Kursun (2016) notes that the best measure of effectiveness for online courses is the client’s success, and not the obtained certificate. In other words, the client may get the desired result after completing only 30% of the course.

D.J. Nicol and M. Coen point out that educational programs, created only with computer technologies, generally make three mistakes. They do not provide their students with communication and feedback from the teacher; students are not accompanied until the end of the course; the course organizers do not consider the information overload of a modern person (Nicol & Coen, 2003). H. Luo, A.C. Robinson and J.Y. Park (2014) note that the reason for the frequent refusal to continue education within MOOC is their newness, which attracts the attention of a certain number of people who are more interested in a new form of organization of the learning process, than in a certificate.

In our opinion, the top priority problem is the selection of a course that best meets students’ needs and corresponds to their level. There is also a need to increase confidence in the results of online education.

In connection with the above-mentioned, there is a need for such MOOC aggregators that allow viewing the catalogue of available courses from different platforms and different developers; using navigation and search tools; choosing courses by topic, developers, specializations, etc.; comparing courses according to the ratings and review from course participants; creating an individual learning pathway (by creating a personal account, reminders of the beginning, etc.).

Thus, the user can make a reasoned decision with the help of MOOC aggregators. The aggregator search engine makes it possible to compare courses offered by different
MOOC providers. These online aggregators aim at helping users solve the problem of finding course providers. However, even with these integrated solutions, there is still a problem of maintaining an adequate level of data quality and customer focus. Relevant data must be always displayed to the users especially in the field of online education, where course offerings are dynamic.

To improve the quality of the provision of educational online services, a customer-oriented focus of the MOOC aggregator is required, which confirms the relevance of this study.

**Literature Review**

There are various approaches to the concept of customer focus in the scientific literature (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cai, 2009</td>
<td>It is such a philosophy of marketing that is aimed at the establishment, maintenance, and reinforcement of mutually beneficial cooperation between all the participants of such processes as planning, production, and distribution of goods, services, and information. It is also aimed at ensuring the long-term prosperity of the enterprise, maintaining and improving the well-being of its partners, consumers, and society as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobs &amp; Suckling, 2007</td>
<td>It is a shift away from the focus on competitiveness and being ahead of the business rivals towards the introduction of unique products aimed at meeting future customers’ needs, which most often involves non-traditional approaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lado, Paulraj &amp; Chen, 2011</td>
<td>It is a desire to understand the client; the compliance with the promises and clients’ expectations; the desire to exceed their expectations; honesty, responsibility, and individual approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mokhtar, 2013</td>
<td>It is a change in the management paradigm in the field of relations, emotions, social orientation, sustainable development, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukerjee, 2013</td>
<td>It is a set of behavioural indicators focusing on clients’ interests and needs to achieve long-term client satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark, 2013</td>
<td>It is such a situation when the university focuses mainly on students’ interests, and their needs and desires become a determining factor in the development of internal organizational processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis of definitions makes it possible to formulate the main criteria of customer focus: fairness; awareness of clients’ needs; analysis of clients’ way to an educational service; evaluation and drawing appropriate conclusions; attention to detail; ability to exceed clients’ expectations.
A customer-oriented aggregator is a web application or Internet site that combines data from multiple sources into a single, customer-friendly interface based on some customer-oriented criteria.

Researchers name the following advantages of MOOC aggregators (Fischer, 2014; Czerniewicz, Deacon, Glover & Walji, 2017):

- Wide range: a large catalogue of various online courses from different providers is presented;
- Comparison: MOOC aggregators publish rankings of online courses and students’ reviews;
- Reduced search time: it is not just a link to MOOC platforms. Aggregators make it easy to find online courses according to various parameters simultaneously on different MOOC platforms;
- The ability to draw up an individual learning plan: MOOC aggregators make it possible to save interesting online courses in the personal account and to set reminders for the date of the start.

Most MOOC are developed by academic institutions and presented to the public on the MOOC providers’ platforms. H. Tang and A. Carr-Chellman (2016) consider MOOC online courses that “allow hundreds of thousands of students to participate simultaneously in the course and are open to everyone interested”.

The first MOOC started as open courses, providing both course materials and a certificate for free. Over time, there has been a shift towards monetization of the courses, and MOOC providers have created more innovative ways to introduce paid services and products (Liyanagunawardena, Lundqvist & Williams, 2015). L. Yuan and S. Powell (2013) found that paid certification is the main source of income for new large MOOC providers (Baker & Passmore, 2016).

As the popularity of MOOC grew, several descriptive MOOC schemes were proposed in the literature (Conole, 2014; Mohamed & Hammond, 2018; Pilli & Admiraal, 2016; Rodriguez, 2012). However, it is unclear if they meet the customer-oriented criteria of MOOC providers and aggregators. Therefore, this article discusses the descriptions of MOOC available for future students who are going to study issues interesting for them.
Research hypothesis: The optimal descriptive MOOC scheme on the MOOC aggregator should satisfy both the academic environment and the customer-oriented criteria that correspond to students’ interests when choosing a MOOC.

Research Objectives

- To analyse course descriptions used by MOOC providers and aggregators for their potential students;
- To develop a set of categories describing MOOC based on this analysis; to use them for the development of a new description of MOOC, which would satisfy both the academic environment and the customer-oriented criteria that correspond to students’ interests when choosing a MOOC.

The article consists of an introduction, literature review, descriptions of research methods, research results and their discussion, and conclusion.

Methods

At the first stage of the study, we identified the four largest MOOC providers and the four most active MOOC aggregators. Four MOOC providers were taken from the list of the main providers presented on the Class Central aggregator.

The identification of the main MOOC aggregators was a more challenging task since some services only existed during short periods and some of them were no longer active. The first step was to search for MOOC aggregators using the Google search engine. The first ten results were analysed and non-functioning aggregators were excluded. The remaining aggregators were visited and then rated based on the number of proposed MOOC and current user interactions seen through comments and reviews on the analysed site. The four most active MOOC aggregators were selected for further analysis. The list was subsequently compared to the results of the search by the keyword “MOOC aggregator” in Google Scholar. The top ten articles were examined to check if they included the four previously selected MOOC aggregators.

At the second stage, we analysed each of the four main MOOC providers identified by Class Central based on the information provided to potential students before their enrolment.

At the third stage, we analysed each of the four main MOOC aggregators from the point of view of the information posted on the site.
Results

Based on the analysis, we identified the descriptions of the MOOC, which were available on the website of the MOOC provider (Table 2). In general, this description is available on specific course pages with some other more general information that is relevant for all courses of the provider.

Table 2 Description of the course available for the future students before the enrolment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>MOOC provider</th>
<th>Description of the course available before the enrolment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Canvas Network</td>
<td>Description of the course and its objectives; Teachers and their characteristics; Starting date; Duration; Temporary responsibility; Requirements (necessary conditions for the course); Type of the course: with or without teachers; Credential: no certification, giving a certificate or a digital badge; Client rating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Coursera</td>
<td>Description of the course; Target audience of the course (including requirements for the course); Institution, which offers the course; Level: beginner, intermediate (mentioned not in all descriptions); Teachers and their characteristics; The number of academic hours per week (mentioned not in all descriptions); Language of the course and the subtitles (if they are available); Requirements for the course completion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>edX</td>
<td>Description of the course; Teachers and their characteristics; The number of academic hours per week; Price; Institution, which offers the course; Subject; Level; Language of the course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>FutureLearn</td>
<td>Payment terms: the courses have a free version, if an expanded version is available, the price is indicated. There is a payment for the access to course materials; Description of the course, including text and video formats; Duration and the number of academic hours per week; Main topics and the objectives of the course; Starting and ending dates; Requirements (necessary conditions for the course); Information about teachers, developers, educational institution, sponsors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the analysis of the four main MOOC aggregators are presented in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 3 Characteristics of the MOOC aggregator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>MOOC aggregator</th>
<th>Characteristics of the MOOC aggregator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Class Central</td>
<td>This MOOC aggregator provides the possibility to search by topic, starting date (including individual pace), or keyword, and the Class Central system will show all relevant courses. It also provides MOOC reports with trends and news. Courses are subdivided into 13 different categories, each of which includes several subcategories (from four to ten). The main categories are computer science (Computer Science, Data Science, Programming), other science and technology (Mathematics, Science, Engineering), arts and humanities (Humanities, Art &amp; Design, Education &amp; Teaching), social sciences (Social Sciences, Business), and the “Health &amp; Medicine” category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MOOC-List</td>
<td>This is a multi-platform course aggregator. It offers several ways of searching in the created database. It shows courses according to their providers, universities, faculties, and tags. The search by tags means the tagging of each course according to the domains that the course covers. For example, such courses as “Java Programming Fundamentals” would have such tags as “Programming”, “Object-oriented”, etc. Most of the search is based on tags.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CourseAggregator</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CourseTalk</td>
<td>This is a multi-platform online course aggregator that includes both MOOC and other types of courses (such as paid and small-scale courses). The search for a course is carried out according to a domain, provider, or the type of the courses (free or paid). The user can also search for courses on the “New Courses” and “Recommendations” pages. These pages are both structured according to the area of study (Art &amp; Design, Business &amp; Management, Education, Humanities, Science &amp; Technology, Sports &amp; Leisure). Recommendations are also divided into subcategories (for example, Art &amp; Design category is subdivided into Design, Music, Performing Arts, and Visual Arts). It is possible to search for new courses by starting date (today, this week, this month) regardless of the type of the course (a new course or an updated version of the already existed course). The aggregator uses the leader boards concept based on users’, teachers’, and providers’ reviews and content ratings, which leads to competition and motivates students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CourseBuffet</td>
<td>This aggregator has a separate classification system which is similar to that used by American universities. Each course from the catalogue is sorted according to its subject area and the level of difficulty. Besides, it is possible to search for a course by one of the 16 subject areas, each of which is subdivided into subcategories, by the university offering the course and the MOOC provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>MOOC aggregator</td>
<td>Description of the course (some aggregators post the description on a separate page, including the provider’s website)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Class Central</td>
<td>Name of the course; Starting date; University; MOOC platform; Rating (based on users’ comments and reviews on the Class Central site. There is a paid opportunity for MOOC to be listed at the top of the page, and in this case, they will automatically receive a 5-star rating); Description (usually copied from the launching platform); Rating in the Top 50; Free/paid; Language; Certification; Time per week; Duration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MOOC-List</td>
<td>Name of the course; Category; Description; MOOC provider; University/Legal entity/Independent MOOC; Language; Providers and categories; Teacher; Country; Certification type; Starting date; 10-star rating and the number of votes; Objectives and results; Curriculum; Price; Tutors; Location; Level; Duration; Number of academic hours per week; Free examination or project; Availability and price for a certificate; Methods (for example, video materials + discussion forum); Categories tags.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CourseTalk</td>
<td>Name of the course; Introduction; Description (usually copied from the launching platform); Price (free/paid); Starting and ending dates; MOOC platform; Course review available for some courses; Key concepts; Description of the platform; Users’ reviews; 5-star rating and the number of reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CourseBuffet</td>
<td>Name of the course; Details; Domain and level; Provider; Availability (for example, always available, available in archive); Similar courses; Reviews; Teachers; Institution; Language; Duration; Starting date.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

The analysis of the reviews of MOOC providers and aggregators revealed 12 categories used to describe courses:

1. Description: several phrases which summarize the content of the course.
2. Domain: in the broad sense, the domain or area of the course.
3. Teachers: names and qualifications.
4. Institution: name and country of the institution which offers the course.
5. Sponsors: organizations that support or sponsor the course.
6. Providers: the platform which offers the course.
7. Time frame: dates and duration details of the course, information on whether it is offered in asynchronous mode (independent pace), and indication of the time per week needed to complete the course.
8. Requirements: necessary access to sources, prior education, and course level.
9. Certification: details about any certificates which can be obtained after successful participation.
10. Price: detailed information about payments or free access.
11. Reviews: feedback or ratings from the former students or others.
12. Language: information about the language(s) of the course, including subtitles.

Table 5 demonstrates the correspondence of the examined MOOC providers and aggregators to each category.

Table 5 Comparative analysis of MOOC providers and aggregators (according to the course description categories)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Canvas</th>
<th>Network</th>
<th>Coursera</th>
<th>edX</th>
<th>Future Learn</th>
<th>Class Central</th>
<th>Course Buffet</th>
<th>Course talk</th>
<th>MOOC List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Domain</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sponsors</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Providers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Time frame</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Requirements</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Certification</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Reviews</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 helps to notice some obvious differences between MOOC providers and aggregators. Ratings and reviews are, for example, the key services of aggregators, since each of them has their system providing this service. However, MOOC providers tend not to have this feature. Only Coursera has the review system, and the Canvas Network uses Class Central ratings and reviews integrated into their course descriptions. Thus, MOOC aggregators differ from MOOC providers primarily in the way they provide students with quality assurance services for courses from various MOOC providers. However, in comparison with MOOC providers, MOOC aggregators tend to provide irrelevant and outdated course information such as starting dates and prices.

In comparison with MOOC aggregators, MOOC providers offer information about course openness (in terms of requirements) and certification. This information is important for providers, but aggregators do not specify it.

The reason for such differences may be the fact that MOOC providers aim at making it as easy as possible for students to join courses, while aggregators help to evaluate the usefulness of the courses.

The comparison of the MOOC description categories showed that the information provided to potential students did not mention anything related to the massive nature of the course, while most of these categories described different aspects of the course. Three categories refer to “Open” (Requirements, Price, and Language) and two categories refer to “Online” (Time frame and Provider).

The comparison of the categories with several studies (Conole, 2014; Mohamed & Hammond, 2018; Pilli & Admiraal, 2016; Rodriguez, 2012) showed that they overlap only partially. The mentioned categories mainly describe the nature of the MOOC and the way of delivery of the course from the point of view of a student. In contrast, the already existing studies focus first of all on the pedagogy of MOOC from the point of view of performers (teachers, institutions, and providers) and researchers studying MOOC.

Thus, MOOC providers and aggregators offer information in a student-oriented form, while existing MOOC research is focused on the academic (scientific) environment (teachers, institutions, and researchers).

A new course description is needed, which would combine both the academic environment and the customer-oriented criteria that correspond to students’ interests when choosing a MOOC.
The proposed description is presented in Table 6, where the abbreviation “MOOC” became a starting point. Each part of the abbreviation is complemented with the categories and concepts resulted from the analysis carried out in this article.

**Table 6 MOOC description, which combines the academic environment and the customer-oriented criteria that correspond to students’ interests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Massive</td>
<td>A set of MOOC-related quantitative data</td>
<td>Enrolment, Retention, Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Aspects contributing to the openness of the course</td>
<td>Requirements, Price, Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>The Internet-related aspects</td>
<td>MOOC platform, Time frame, Use of multimedia, Availability (variety)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course’s aspects</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Certification, Assessment method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>With teacher, Without teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Quality assurance, Reviews, Ratings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service provision</td>
<td>Teachers, Institution, Sponsors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domain</td>
<td>Description, Area, Curriculum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**

The following conclusions can be drawn from the study.

Today, the world is facing the rapid development of online education. The emergence of MOOC made it possible for the world’s leading educational institutions to combine their efforts to make the best education available to everyone. The increased number of courses and providers raises the problem of choosing the course that best suits the user. The most promising means of solving the problems associated with a reasoned decision on a course choice is the use of MOOC aggregators, which combine such functions as informing, consulting, evaluating, and making recommendations for the optimal choice of a course.
The given study focuses on the information provided to potential students about MOOC from the four most popular MOOC providers and aggregators that were previously identified and analysed. Twelve different categories were identified as the most commonly used to describe different MOOC: description; domain; teachers; institution; sponsors; providers; time frame; requirements; certification; price; reviews; language.

It was found that MOOC providers and aggregators slightly differ in focus. For example, MOOC aggregators focus on ratings and reviews and provide potential students with tools to compare different MOOC. In contrast, MOOC providers mostly focus on the openness of MOOC, for instance, on the description of the requirements and the possibility to obtain a certificate. Despite the declared massiveness of the MOOC, neither MOOC providers nor MOOC aggregators did not reflect this in the course’s descriptions.

A new MOOC description is proposed according to the identified categories, and the abbreviation “MOOC” became a starting point. Most of the categories in the new description relate to course aspects of MOOC: assessment, pedagogy, quality, service provision, and domain. Based on these combined categories, we developed a description that combines academic views and customer-oriented information for the potential students and, therefore, provides a more comprehensive description of MOOC.

Thus, the results of the study confirmed the hypothesis that the optimal descriptive MOOC scheme on the MOOC aggregator should satisfy both the academic environment and the customer-oriented criteria that correspond to students’ interests when choosing a MOOC.

The limitation for this study is the focus on the information provided to students on a selected set of platforms and aggregators in English, and not on the desired information or on students’ motivation to complete the course. Further research is required, focusing on the different points of view of students on the usefulness of the information while choosing MOOC, as well as other information useful in making decisions.
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