

## UNDERSTANDING THE ROLE OF MOOCS IN REDUCING OR REINFORCING LEARNING INEQUALITIES

Aastha Bhatia<sup>1</sup>, Annivia Pereira<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup> Department of Humanities and Science, Fr. Conceicao Rodrigues College of Engineering,  
Bandra (W), Mumbai 400050, India.

Email: [aasthabhatia32@gmail.com](mailto:aasthabhatia32@gmail.com)<sup>1</sup>, [anniviapereira22@gmail.com](mailto:anniviapereira22@gmail.com)<sup>2</sup>

### Abstract

Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) promised to democratize education by removing geographical, economic, and institutional barriers (Hansen & Reich, 2015; Selwyn, 2016). Positioned as tools for global learning, MOOCs have opened new pathways for knowledge acquisition, skill development, and international academic engagement. However, recent studies indicate that the benefits of MOOCs are unevenly distributed (Reich and Ruipérez-Valiente, Zawacki-Richter et al.), raising questions about whether their role is to reduce gaps or paradoxically reinforce existing global learning inequalities. This paper examines the dual nature of MOOCs by analyzing enrolment patterns, completion rates, and digital accessibility. It argues that while MOOCs expand access to high-quality educational content, structural challenges - such as the digital divide, language barriers, limited curricular relevance, and weak credential recognition - restrict their overall impact. Using a mixed-methods review of recent literature, the paper highlights how MOOCs often attract learners who are already educationally privileged. This study examines how students actually utilize MOOCs and whether these online courses make learning more accessible. It examines simple, practical factors such as who joins MOOCs, how often they participate, and what challenges they face. The research also explores new efforts to make MOOCs more inclusive, such as using local languages, mobile-friendly formats, and low internet options. The aim is to understand whether MOOCs can genuinely support students from diverse backgrounds or whether they still work better for those who are already educationally advantaged.

**Keywords:** MOOCs, Accessibility, Inequality, Inclusivity, Barriers.

► *Corresponding Author: Aastha Bhatia*

### Introduction

Massive Open Online Courses are among the significant innovations (MOOCs) that offer online learning opportunities to diverse populations. MOOCs marked their early sprouting in 2010; as a varied learning tool, they hold the capability of breaking down the long-stagnating barriers to education, including cost and institutional exclusivity. Prestigious universities and organizations offer MOOCs in disciplines ranging from engineering and business to literature and social sciences, reaching millions of learners worldwide through platforms such as Coursera, edX, and FutureLearn. Learners worldwide, particularly those seeking flexible and affordable alternatives to formal education, count on such platforms.

Recognizing the potential of MOOCs to expand educational access, the Government of India has launched several initiatives to support MOOCs, strengthen digital access, and promote inclusive

online learning, particularly with the aim of reducing educational inequalities. One of the most prominent platforms is SWAYAM (Study Webs of Active-Learning for Young Aspiring Minds), which provides free, self-paced online courses spanning school, higher education, and vocational programs. Developed by top Indian institutions, SWAYAM allows learners who are unable to attend traditional classroom programs to access high-quality education remotely. Another significant initiative is DIKSHA (Digital Infrastructure for Knowledge Sharing), a national platform offering curriculum-aligned digital content for students and teachers in multiple Indian languages. DIKSHA provides e-textbooks, instructional videos, and professional development modules, helping to ensure equitable access to learning materials across diverse regions. Similarly, PM eVidya (Government of India, *PM eVidya*) introduced under the Atmanirbhar Bharat initiative, unifies e-learning efforts across platforms by providing online courses, radio and television lessons, and printed materials, catering even to learners without reliable internet access (Warschauer and Matuchniak; Selwyn).

At the higher education level, the National Programme on Technology Enhanced Learning (NPTEL), funded by the Ministry of Education and developed by premier institutions such as the IITs and IISc, offers openly accessible courses in science, engineering, and humanities. NPTEL also provides translations into regional languages to increase inclusivity. Complementing these efforts, infrastructure initiatives like BharatNet aim to connect rural and remote Gram Panchayats with high-speed broadband, enabling schools and community centers to access platforms such as SWAYAM (Government of India, Ministry of Education) and DIKSHA (Government of India, Ministry of Education). To address digital literacy, programs such as PMGDISHA (Pradhan Mantri Gramin Digital Saksharta Abhiyan) and Internet Saathi train rural citizens - particularly women - in digital skills, who then support learning in their communities. Furthermore, SWAYAM Prabha broadcasts educational content through 32 DTH channels, allowing students in underserved areas to access course materials without high-bandwidth internet.

Despite these extensive initiatives, MOOCs continue to generate considerable debate regarding their actual impact on educational inequality. While MOOCs are often promoted as mechanisms for democratizing knowledge through open access to high-quality education, research indicates that they largely serve learners who are already socially and educationally advantaged, with access to technology, prior academic training, and linguistic proficiency. Digital access remains uneven; reliable high-speed internet and personal devices are still scarce in many rural, tribal, and remote areas, limiting sustained engagement with MOOCs. Broadcast solutions like SWAYAM Prabha provide access but do not allow interactive learning, assessment, or certification, which are essential for meaningful participation. Digital literacy gaps also persist, as learners may struggle with managing self-paced courses, navigating learning platforms, or engaging in online discussions.

Language and localization gaps further constrain inclusivity. While content in Indian languages has increased, a large portion of advanced or specialized courses remains English-dominated, and translations often lack cultural relevance. This can reduce comprehension and practical applicability for diverse learners. Additionally, most government-supported MOOC platforms focus primarily on content delivery, offering limited learner support such as mentoring, counseling, or peer guidance. First-generation learners or those unfamiliar with self-directed learning often require structured pathways and feedback mechanisms, which remain largely absent. Finally, credential recognition and integration gaps reduce long-term impact. Credit transfer policies vary across institutions, and employer recognition of MOOC certificates is inconsistent, limiting social and economic mobility for marginalized learners.

Taken together, these persistent challenges - ranging from uneven digital access and linguistic barriers to limited learner support and inconsistent credential recognition - raise critical questions about the equity potential of MOOCs. Against this backdrop, this paper seeks to examine whether MOOCs function as instruments of educational inclusion or whether they ultimately reproduce and reinforce existing inequalities within digital learning environments.

### **Learning Inequalities: A Conceptual Overview**

To address this question, it is necessary to situate MOOCs within the broader debate on learning inequalities. Learning inequalities refer to the systematic and structural disparities in educational access, participation, and outcomes among learners from different social, economic, cultural, and geographic backgrounds. These inequalities are not incidental but deeply rooted within the broader structures of power, privilege, and historical exclusion, shaping who is able to benefit from the educational system and to what extent. Factors such as socio-economic status, rural-urban divide, language proficiency, gender norms, disability, and prior educational attainment significantly influence learners' opportunities and patterns of educational attainment. Within traditional education systems, learning inequalities are evident in uneven school infrastructure and quality, differential access to qualified teachers and pedagogical resources, constrained access to higher education for marginalized groups, and the stratification of employment opportunities based on institutional prestige and social capital.

In the digital age, learning inequalities continue to persist, but they are predominantly shaped by new technological and informational divides. Active and sustained educational engagement now requires certain essential prerequisites, including access to digital devices, stable internet connectivity, and digital literacy. Beyond mere access, these disparities are further intensified by differences in learners' digital competencies, capacity for self-directed learning, and ability to leverage digital credentials for social or economic advancement. Therefore, educational innovations such as MOOCs demand examination through a critical lens, as they simultaneously offer opportunities for knowledge democratization but also risk reinforcing or intensifying existing structural inequalities. While MOOCs promise open access and scalability, their benefits tend to concentrate disproportionately among learners who already possess educational, linguistic, and technological advantages. Understanding learning inequalities, therefore, helps understand whether MOOCs actually promote educational inclusion or merely relocate long-standing inequalities into virtual learning environments.

### **MOOCs and Expanded Access to Education**

Within this context of persistent learning inequalities, MOOCs are often presented as interventions designed to widen access to education. Reducing barriers to education is one of the most commonly considered advantages of MOOCs. This potential gets accelerated by the MOOCs that are often free or offered at a very nominal cost, making them learner-centric and especially for those who cannot afford formal higher education. Additionally, MOOCs eliminate access restrictions by opening learning from world-class institutions without relocating. Furthermore, MOOCs offer time and pace flexibility, which is particularly beneficial for working professionals, caregivers, and adult learners. The learner-controlled timing of MOOCs allows learners to study and make their own customized schedules, which further accommodates diverse personal and professional commitments. This flexibility supports inclusive participation and lifelong learning, especially for individuals excluded from conventional education systems. However, the extent to which these

access-oriented features translate into effective learning outcomes is influenced by underlying digital and infrastructural conditions.

### **MOOCs and the Reproduction of Learning Inequalities**

#### **Digital Divides and Technological Barriers in MOOCs**

MOOCs promise a fair learning environment that is accessible to everyone, but reliable internet connectivity and appropriate digital devices remain crucial across and within countries. These factors can affect the learning of the learners in low-income or rural areas who have access to merely unstable connections and limited bandwidth. Their dependence is still on mobile devices, which may not support complex learning tasks effectively. Digital literacy also plays a crucial role in shaping learner experiences. Navigating online platforms, participating in discussion forums, and managing self-paced learning require a level of technological competence that cannot be assumed universally. Learners lacking digital skills may struggle to engage meaningfully with MOOCs, leading to frustration, disengagement, and dropout. Thus, the digital ecosystem extends beyond access to encompass differences in usage and competence, reinforcing existing educational inequalities.

#### **Language and Cultural Barriers to Inclusive MOOC Participation**

MOOCs are promoted as open and globally accessible learning platforms, but the overwhelming dominance of English as the medium of instruction creates inequality in participation. Learners from English-speaking or English-educated backgrounds are better positioned to comprehend lecture content, engage in discussion forums, and perform well in assessments. In contrast, non-native English speakers often experience difficulties in understanding the academic jargon, following spoken lectures, and articulating responses, even when they possess adequate subject knowledge. These linguistic challenges can negatively affect confidence, participation levels, and course completion rates.

Many MOOCs reflect Western academic conventions, communication styles, and cultural references, which may not align with the experiences of learners from diverse socio-cultural contexts. Examples, case studies, and discussion prompts rooted in Western settings can appear distant or irrelevant to learners from other regions, limiting meaningful engagement. The absence of localized content and multilingual support can alienate learners and reduce the practical applicability of course material. It should be designed in a more culturally responsive way.

#### **Barriers to Participation and Course Completion in MOOCs**

Although MOOCs attract millions of learners, course completion rates remain consistently low. This low completion can be explained by the self-directed nature of these courses, which requires learners to maintain motivation, manage time effectively, and navigate complex online content independently (Broadbent & Poon). Research shows that only a small proportion of enrolled participants finish courses, and these learners are typically those with higher levels of prior education, academic and professional experience, and self-regulated learning skills (Reich & Ruipérez-Valiente). These patterns indicate that MOOCs disproportionately benefit individuals who already possess educational, social, and technological advantages, as they are better equipped to handle the demands of independent online learning.

While the self-directed design of MOOCs is often celebrated for promoting autonomy and extensive reach, it creates barriers for learners who require structured guidance and instructional support. Limited access to instructors, coupled with heavy dependence on peer forums and self-

guided learning, may place first-generation learners or those unfamiliar with autonomous learning at a distinct disadvantage (Broadbent & Poon). Consequently, these structural features of MOOCs tend to reinforce existing disparities in educational resources, suggesting a design intended to democratize learning can unintentionally perpetuate academic and social inequities.

### **Inequalities in Credentialing and Post-Course Outcomes**

The completion certificates offered by MOOCs vary widely in recognition and value (Hansen & Reich; Reich & Ruipérez-Valiente). Some employers acknowledge MOOC certificates as indicators of skill development, while others prioritize formal degrees. It still adds an advantage to the academic showcase, but many of the certificates require payment, reintroducing financial barriers that contradict the ethos of open access. Learners with existing educational qualifications are more likely to leverage MOOC credentials to enhance career prospects, while the underprivileged learners may struggle to translate course completion into tangible economic benefits. As a result, MOOCs may amplify the advantages of already-privileged learners, reinforcing outcome inequalities rather than mitigating them completely.

### **Enabling Access: Conditions for MOOCs to Bridge Learning Gaps**

The capacity of MOOCs to reduce educational gaps is not inherent but conditional. Despite persistent structural and pedagogical challenges, MOOCs possess a conditional potential to mitigate educational inequalities. A central condition for MOOCs to promote equitable learning opportunities is the availability of robust digital infrastructure. Ensuring reliable high-speed internet, affordable access to devices, and stable electricity allows learners from underrepresented or rural areas to participate effectively, preventing exclusion due to technological limitations. In addition, multilingual content and culturally relevant course materials enhance accessibility for learners who are not proficient in dominant languages, enabling a wider and more diverse range of students to engage meaningfully with the course material.

Equally essential are learner support systems that provide structured guidance for students with limited prior experience in online learning. Components such as guided tutorials, step-by-step instructions, interactive feedback, and mentorship networks can help learners navigate the challenges of self-directed study, particularly benefiting first-generation students or those with limited prior academic experience. Blended learning models, which integrate online content with local mentoring, tutoring, or institutional support, have proven effective in bridging the divide between traditional classroom education and online learning environments. These approaches enable learners to contextualize course material and benefit from the structured support frequently absent in fully self-directed MOOC settings.

Policy interventions also play a critical role in enhancing the equity potential of MOOCs. Government investment in broadband expansion, digital literacy programs, and affordable device distribution can promote technological equity among learners. Additionally, establishing formal recognition frameworks for MOOC credentials - such as credit transfer systems, employer-recognized certifications, or integration into national qualification frameworks can help ensure that participation in MOOCs results in concrete educational and professional outcomes.

Finally, integrating MOOCs into formal education systems and aligning them with labor market demands can significantly enhance their capacity to promote educational equity. When incorporated into school curricula, vocational training programs, or professional development initiatives, MOOCs can complement traditional learning and provide flexible opportunities for learners who might otherwise lack access to higher education or skill development. By offering

recognized credentials, relevant skill-based content, and pathways for career advancement, MOOCs can serve as instruments of social inclusion and economic mobility within formal education systems.

### **Conclusion**

MOOCs hold the potential to democratize access to knowledge, but they are deeply embedded within existing structures of inequality. Issues of digital access, language dominance, learner preparedness, and credential recognition shape who benefits from MOOCs and who is left behind. This paper has explored that MOOCs are neither all-inclusive nor inherently exclusionary. Their effect on learning inequalities depends on how they are designed, implemented, and supported. To move beyond mere access toward meaningful inclusion, MOOCs require equity-oriented policies, inclusive teaching approaches, and strong learner support systems. With such deliberate efforts, MOOCs can contribute to educational equity rather than reinforcing digital inequalities.

MOOCs address a few gaps, but a multi-pronged strategy is needed to strengthen the learning stages further by ensuring the availability of high-speed internet and affordable devices in rural and remote areas. Second, equipping learners with the ability to navigate online platforms, manage self-paced courses, and participate effectively in virtual discussions through awareness lectures in the specially established computer centres in the rural areas. Third, MOOC content should be more linguistically and culturally inclusive, offering courses in multiple languages and using locally relevant examples to enhance comprehension and engagement. Fourth, structured learner support systems - including mentoring, peer guidance, and regular feedback - should be integrated into platforms to help learners complete courses successfully. Credential recognition should be standardized and widely accepted, linking MOOC completion to formal education credits and employment opportunities. By implementing these measures, MOOCs can provide meaningful educational opportunities to all learners regardless of their background.

### **References**

1. Broadbent, J., and W. L. Poon. "Self-Regulated Learning Strategies & Academic Achievement in Online Higher Education Learning Environments: A Systematic Review." *The Internet and Higher Education*, vol. 27, 2015, pp. 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2015.04.007>.
2. Czerniewicz, L., A. Deacon, J. Small, and S. Walji. "Developing World MOOCs: A Curriculum View of the MOOC Landscape." *Journal of Global Literacies, Technologies, and Emerging Pedagogies*, vol. 4, no. 1, 2017, pp. 122-139.
3. Government of India, Ministry of Education. *PM eVidya: A Comprehensive Initiative for Digital Education*. 2020, <https://www.education.gov.in>.
4. Government of India, Ministry of Education. *SWAYAM: Study Webs of Active-Learning for Young Aspiring Minds*. 2021, <https://swayam.gov.in>.
5. Government of India, Ministry of Education. *DIKSHA: Digital Infrastructure for Knowledge Sharing*. 2022, <https://diksha.gov.in>.
6. Government of India, Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology. *Pradhan Mantri Gramin Digital Saksharta Abhiyan (PMGDISHA)*. 2021, <https://www.pmgdisha.in>.
7. Hansen, J. D., and J. Reich. "Democratizing Education? Examining Access and Usage Patterns in Massive Open Online Courses." *Science*, vol. 350, no. 6265, 2015, pp. 1245-1248. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aab3782>.

8. Kizilcec, R. F., M. Pérez-Sanagustín, and J. J. Maldonado. "Self-Regulated Learning Strategies Predict Learner Behavior and Goal Attainment in Massive Open Online Courses." *Computers & Education*, vol. 104, 2017, pp. 18-33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2016.10.001>.
9. Reich, J., and J. A. Ruipérez-Valiente. "The MOOC Pivot." *Science*, vol. 363, no. 6423, 2019, pp. 130-131. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aav7958>.
10. Selwyn, N. *Education and Technology: Key Issues and Debates*. 2nd ed., Bloomsbury Academic, 2016.
11. UNESCO. *Reimagining Our Futures Together: A New Social Contract for Education*. UNESCO Publishing, 2021.
12. Warschauer, M., and T. Matuchniak. "New Technology and Digital Worlds: Analyzing Evidence of Equity in Access, Use, and Outcomes." *Review of Research in Education*, vol. 34, no. 1, 2010, pp. 179–225. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X09349791>.
13. Zawacki-Richter, O., A. Bozkurt, U. Alturki, and A. Aldraiweesh. "What Research Says About MOOCs—An Explorative Content Analysis." *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, vol. 19, no. 1, 2018, pp. 242-259. <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v19i1.3356>