SkillSwap: A Campus-First, Credit-Based Peer Mentoring System—
Synthesizing Research on Peer Learning, Matching Algorithms, Gamification, and Trust

Rahul Purohit, Arun Kachhawa, Priyanka Rathore, Kumkum Tripathi, Shreya Agarwal
Department of Computer Science and Engineering
JECRC University, Jaipur, India
Semester VII

***Abstract*—This paper presents SkillSwap, a comprehensive campus-first, credit-based peer mentoring platform designed to democratize skill development among higher education students. Drawing synthesis from eighteen seminal research papers across peer-to-peer learning, matching algorithms, gamification, trust and reputation systems, learning outcome evaluation, and incentive design, we articulate a rigorous theoretical foundation and design justification for our system. SkillSwap integrates algorithmic skill matching, non-monetary credit economies, robust verification and reputation layers, adaptive gamification, and user-centric design to address persistent gaps in personalized, experiential learning. In this paper, we describe how the system is structured, outline its major features, and explain the evaluation methods we plan to use. These methods focus on tracking user engagement, learning progress, trust score stability, and the overall condition of the community. Early testing with a small prototype indicates that users responded well, with a high level of satisfaction and steady participation. The paper also identifies the main limitations of the current version, points to areas that require further study, and offers suggestions for expanding the model across larger or more varied campus environments. More generally, the work shows how evidence from different research areas can guide the development of useful educational technologies and provide a solid reference point for future peer learning platforms.**

***Index Terms*—peer-to-peer learning, matching algorithms, gamification, trust and reputation, credit-based incentive systems, educational technology, campus learning communities, skill development**

I. Introduction

Traditional ways of building skills have been disrupted by the growth of digital technologies, yet many obstacles remain. Students still face gaps in access, personalisation, and support, even with the availability of modern tools. Students face prohibitive costs in accessing specialized learning platforms, limited personalization in one-directional e-learning models, and insufficient mechanisms to leverage peer expertise within campus communities [2], [7], [9]. Recent studies show that peer learning can be highly effective when it is supported by strong matching algorithms, well designed incentive structures, and reliable systems for building trust. Under these conditions, students tend to participate more actively, stay involved for longer periods, and achieve better learning outcomes. [1], [5], [23].

The Skill Swap platform is designed to respond to this overlap between what students need and the opportunities that current systems fail to provide. By integrating research-validated mechanisms non-monetary credit economies, adaptive matching algorithms, gamified engagement, and digital trust layers we propose a scalable, equity-focused solution for campus-driven peer skill development. Our motivation comes from research showing that peer learning can lower psychological barriers, encourage mutually supportive relationships, and speed up the development of both technical and interpersonal skills [2], [5], [23], [28].

This paper contributes three primary deliverables: (1) a thematic synthesis of eighteen research papers across five complementary domains, (2) a detailed platform architecture that operationalizes research insights through integrated feature design, and (3) a comprehensive evaluation framework, grounded in prior literature, for measuring platform impact on engagement, learning, trust, and community health.

II. Background and Related Work

A. Peer-to-Peer Learning: Theoretical Foundations and Empirical Evidence

Peer learning has a well-established theoretical and empirical foundation in educational research. Lave and Wenger's influential research on situated learning [13] shows that people learn more effectively when the process takes place within real activities, shared environments, and active communities of practice. This principle directly motivates campus-based peer learning, where geographic and temporal proximity, shared institutional affiliation, and complementary skill sets create ideal conditions for effective knowledge exchange [2], [5].

Meta-analytic evidence from Johnson and Johnson [5] confirms that cooperative, peer-based learning consistently outperforms individualistic or instructor-led approaches across dimensions of achievement, interpersonal relationships, and psychological well-being. Ruegg et al. [6] further document that peer tutoring enhances communication skills, self-efficacy, and knowledge retention, particularly when structured to support active, reciprocal participation. Topping's extensive review [5] suggests that peer learning can play an important role in strengthening students' understanding and lowering their anxiety, both of which are essential for making skill development more accessible.

B. Matching Algorithms and Skill Discovery

Effective matching between mentors and learners continues to be one of the main difficulties in expanding peer based education. Recent progress in algorithmic approaches has shown clear gains in match quality, user satisfaction, and related learning outcomes. Shah et al. [1] present MentorMate, which uses a K means clustering method and reports 99.7% valid matches, defined as mentor and learner pairs that share at least two common attributes. The system is also able to handle a dataset of 1,500 users in 4.08 seconds. Their approach treats mentors as fixed cluster centers and links learners to them through Euclidean distance, resulting in better performance than simpler rule based techniques and showing that this method can support large university environments.

Yang and Dong [7] present an intelligent talent recommendation algorithm employing deep learning for context-adaptive ranking.Their method combines several forms of similarity scoring with user preference weights and past behavioral data, which allows the system to generate personalized recommendations that improve over time through repeated feedback. Such adaptive ranking mechanisms are instrumental in maintaining match quality as platform user bases and skill inventories expand [7], [20], [30].

The algorithmic foundation for Skill Swap draws directly from these advances: we employ modified K-means clustering with context-aware weighting to balance skill overlap, schedule compatibility, reputation scores, and credit balances, ensuring both new and established users receive relevant matches.

C. Gamification: Motivation, Engagement, and Learning Outcomes

Gamification, which involves using elements of game design in settings outside of games, has become an effective way to increase student engagement in educational environments. Oliver's meta-synthesis [3] documents that well-designed gamification enhances motivation, transforms assessment, and addresses persistent barriers to active participation, particularly in online and distance learning contexts. The core mechanisms points, badges, levels, leaderboards when meaningfully aligned with pedagogical objectives, consistently improve retention, knowledge absorption, and learner satisfaction [3], [6], [11], [14], [27].

Critically, research distinguishes between superficial point-accrual systems and architecturally sound gamification. Rahimi et al. [6] demonstrate that incentive system design substantially modulates learning outcomes: systems offering both extrinsic rewards (points, badges) and intrinsic motivation pathways (autonomy, mastery, social recognition) yield superior long-term engagement. Pappas' synthesis [3], [11], [14] identifies five high-impact gamification features: (1) increased learner engagement through active participation, (2) interactive, immersive learning experiences, (3) enhanced knowledge absorption and retention via endorphin release, (4) real-world application visibility, and (5) democratized access across age groups and learning styles.

For Skill Swap, gamification serves dual roles: (1) immediate engagement and habit formation via point accrual and badge achievement for completed sessions and peer validations, and (2) sustained community participation through public leaderboards, achievement tier progression, and social recognition mechanisms. Importantly, our model integrates gamification with our credit economy, such that point rewards directly translate to teachable credit availability, preventing disconnects between gamified motivation and tangible platform utility.

D. Trust, Reputation, and Verification in Peer Communities

Peer driven platforms naturally encounter several risks, including uneven access to information, opportunistic actions by users, coordinated manipulation, and unreliable feedback. To address these issues, Xiong and Liu's PeerTrust model [4] proposes an advanced trust framework that brings together feedback from past interactions, weighted assessments of a reviewer's credibility, the depth of a user's transaction history, and adjustments that take the surrounding context into account. The model mitigates gaming through feedback diversity constraints and temporal decay factors, demonstrating that reputation systems grounded in principled trust metrics can sustain healthy peer ecosystems at scale [4], [8], [17], [20], [31], [33].

Critically, reputation cannot rely on raw feedback volume; instead, weighted credibility assessment factoring the reputation of the feedback provider, recency, and diversity of evaluators is essential. Skill Swap implements a modified version of PeerTrust's framework: all user-to-user interactions (completed sessions, skill validations, peer feedback) contribute to adaptive trust scores. New users are supported via provisional credit allocations and algorithmic scaffolding to prevent cold-start barriers, while established users with high trust scores unlock advanced features (e.g., expanded mentee capacity, exclusive skill groups). Dispute resolution mechanisms and administrative oversight provide guardrails against systemic manipulation [4], [8], [17], [20], [33].

E. Non-Monetary Incentive Systems and Credit Economies

Economic barriers to learning disproportionately affect resource-constrained students. Jadhav et al.'s Connectra platform [2] empirically validates that non-monetary, peer-to-peer skill exchange removes primary access barriers: 76% of survey respondents avoid skill development due to cost, and 82% express willingness to teach others. Connectra's non-monetary design increases intrinsic motivation (participants engage without personal financial gain), reduces status hierarchies (all play dual teacher-learner roles), and fosters community sustainability through reciprocal relationships rather than monetary transactions [2], [10], [13], [15].

Gentle and Genitty [25] examine credit systems as alternative currencies in educational contexts, noting that well-designed non-monetary systems support equity, reduce power imbalances, and align incentive structures with prosocial behaviors. Ryan and Deci's self-determination theory [15] further predicts that intrinsically motivated environments (autonomy, competence, relatedness) outperform purely transactional models in sustained engagement and transfer of learning.

Skill Swap applies these ideas by using a credit based system. Every completed session gives credits to both the teacher and the learner, with the amount depending on the length of the session, how satisfied the learner was, and whether both participants confirmed the interaction. These credits do not represent money and cannot be used outside the platform. Instead, they are linked to specific privileges within the system, such as higher scheduling priority, increased profile visibility, or the ability to level up in different skill categories. This structure is intended to promote fairness, keep users engaged over time, and encourage meaningful and well conducted interactions.

F. Learning Outcome Evaluation and User Experience Design

Effective platforms are evaluated not solely on feature richness, but on downstream outcomes: skill acquisition, sustained engagement, learning satisfaction, and trust evolution. Topping's meta-analysis [5] documents that peer tutoring consistently improves pre-to-post achievement measures, with effect sizes largest for complex, multidimensional skills where peer interaction surface area is greatest. Ruegg et al. [6] similarly report improved knowledge retention, communication competencies, and reduced academic stress when peer learning is structured to support active participation and reciprocal feedback.

User experience design in educational platforms directly impacts adoption and persistence. Recent work emphasizes accessibility (contrast, touch target sizing), progressive disclosure (feature complexity revealed incrementally), and intuitive navigation [2], [13], [18]. Mobile-first design is critical: GSMA Intelligence [17] reports 78% global smartphone penetration (2021), with accelerating growth in lower-income regions. Educational applications optimized for mobile contexts can democratize access and support learning in contexts where desktop resources are unavailable [2], [18].

Skill Swap prioritizes user experience through: (1) mobile-first responsive design, (2) progressive feature disclosure (beginners see simplified matching and basic messaging; established users unlock advanced features), (3) accessibility compliance (WCAG 2.1 AA color contrast, appropriate touch targets), (4) real-time feedback loops (session completion confirmations, reputation updates, credit notifications), and (5) clear, contextual help systems [2], [13], [18].

III. Motivation and Problem Statement

A. The Skills Gap and Access Barriers

Contemporary higher education faces a persistent mismatch between campus-delivered curricula and workplace skill demands [2], [7]. Major e-learning platforms (Udemy, Coursera, Skillshare) address this gap through monetized, content-delivery models, but this approach introduces new barriers: (1) direct costs prohibitive for many students, particularly in developing economies [2], [19], (2) one-directional knowledge transmission that underutilizes peer expertise [5], [23], (3) limited personalization and insufficient mechanisms for learner connection [2], [9], and (4) absence of robust verification, making credential value uncertain [4], [8].

Campus learning communities have the potential to support strong peer based skill development, yet they often function in a scattered and manual manner. Many institutional mentoring programs still depend on informal matching practices, incomplete or irregular records of availability, and processes that do not scale well beyond a few selected pairs or small groups. This gap between opportunity and implementation is the problem Skill Swap directly addresses.

B. Research-Informed Problem Definition

Our problem statement integrates evidence from multiple domains:

1) **Access and Equity**: Monetary and informational barriers disproportionately limit skill development access for economically disadvantaged students [2], [9], [19].
2) **Engagement and Motivation**: Transactional, one-directional learning models underperform compared to reciprocal, peer-driven models in sustained engagement and psychological outcomes [5], [23], [28].
3) **Matching and Discovery**: Manual mentor-mentee matching is inefficient and suboptimal; algorithmic approaches demonstrably improve match quality and scalability [1], [7], [20].
4) **Trust and Verification**: Peer-driven systems require robust reputation mechanisms to defend against opportunism, misinformation, and collusion [4], [8], [17], [20], [31], [33].
5) **Incentive Alignment**: Non-monetary incentive systems demonstrably enhance equity, intrinsic motivation, and community sustainability compared to purely transactional models [2], [10], [13], [15], [25].

IV. System Design and Architecture

A. Core Platform Features

Skill Swap comprises six integrated feature modules:

1) User Onboarding and Profile Verification: Multi-factor verification ensures trust and reduces entry barriers: email validation, institutional affiliation verification (optional), and self-reported skill assertions with peer-validation mechanisms [4], [8], [17]. Verification levels (unverified, verified, highly-verified) determine platform privileges and algorithmic visibility, aligning incentive structures toward honest participation [4], [17].

2) Skill Inventory and Adaptive Matching: Users define both teachable and learnable skills along dimensions: category (technical, interpersonal, creative, professional), proficiency (novice, intermediate, expert), and interest intensity. The matching algorithm employs K-means clustering with context-aware weighting: skill overlap (Euclidean distance in skill vector space), schedule intersection, reputation score normalization, and credit balance constraints ensure both relevance and fairness [1], [7], [20].

3) Credit-Based Peer Mentoring Economy: All sessions are transacted through platform credits: mentors earn credits for teaching, mentees earn credits (at reduced rate) for participating, and both gain reputation points. Credits are non-monetary, non-transferable off-platform, and convertible to platform privileges (scheduling priority, algorithmic visibility boost, access to advanced features). This design directly addresses equity, prevents monetary barriers, and maintains intrinsic motivation incentives [2], [10], [13], [15], [25].

4) Scheduling and Session Management: Integrated calendar, session reminders, virtual meeting links (Google Meet, Zoom), real-time messaging, and post-session feedback collection support frictionless interaction [2], [5], [13]. Session metadata (duration, completion status, participant satisfaction) feed directly into reputation and credit calculations.

5) Gamification and Progress Tracking: Points (allocated per session), badges (achievement milestones: "First Session," "Top Mentor," "Community Builder"), levels (progression tiers), and leaderboards (public ranking by reputation and credit accrual) provide immediate feedback and social recognition [3], [6], [11], [14]. Critically, gamification mechanics are meaningfully aligned with learning objectives: level progression reflects demonstrated teaching and learning competence, not arbitrary point accumulation.

6) Reputation and Trust Framework: Adaptive trust scoring combines: (1) transaction-based feedback (post-session ratings and comments from mentees), (2) peer validation (community members endorsing skills), (3) account history depth (older accounts with consistent participation weighted higher), and (4) diversity of feedback sources (ratings from diverse partners weighted more heavily than clustered feedback) [4], [8], [17], [20], [31], [33]. Dispute resolution mechanisms (user appeals, administrative review) and transparency measures (users view their reputation factors) defend against gaming.

B. Integration of Research Evidence into Design Decisions

Algorithmic Matching Decision: We selected K-means clustering (vs. mean-shift or hierarchical approaches) because it permits fixed cluster centroids (mentors) and scalable distance computation, critical for large user bases and real-time responsiveness [1], [7]. Shah et al.'s empirical validation (99.7% match validity at 1,500 users) justified this choice over more complex, computationally intensive alternatives.

Non-Monetary Credit Economy: Adoption of non-monetary incentives is directly justified by Jadhav et al.'s Connectra study [2], which documents 93% user satisfaction in non-monetary peer exchange and 82% willingness to teach when financial barriers are removed. This contrasts sharply with monetary platform costs (48% of surveyed students avoid skill-development due to cost), and aligns with self-determination theory predicting superior intrinsic motivation in autonomy-supporting, non-transactional environments [15].

Gamification Architecture: Our implementation reflects Oliver's and Pappas' synthesis: meaningful game mechanics (aligned with pedagogical objectives), continuous feedback loops (real-time notifications), and integration with platform incentive structures (level progression reflects demonstrated competence, not arbitrary effort) [3], [6], [11], [14]. We deliberately avoid superficial badge systems, grounding all gamification in learning and community health metrics.

Trust and Verification Framework: The reputation model directly implements Xiong and Liu's PeerTrust architecture [4], adapted for educational contexts. Weighted credibility assessment, feedback diversity constraints, and provisional credit allocations for new users mitigate cold-start problems and defend against collusion [4], [8], [17], [20], [31], [33].

User Experience and Accessibility: Mobile-first design, progressive feature disclosure, and accessibility compliance reflect established best practices [2], [13], [18], [21]. We prioritize intuitive navigation (material design principles), real-time feedback, and context-sensitive help to reduce cognitive load and support users new to peer-driven learning platforms.

V. Methodology and Prototype Development

A. Research-Backed Design Rationale

Skill Swap adopted a user-centered, iterative development cycle informed by stakeholder interviews, competitive gap analysis, and continuous evidence synthesis:

1) **Requirements Analysis**: Surveys with 35+ students and early-career professionals identified pain points: 76% avoid skill development due to cost, 82% would teach if barriers were removed, 91% prefer practical learning, 68% struggle with personalized resources [2]. These findings directly shaped the platform's value proposition (cost-free, reciprocal, practical, personalized).
2) **Competitive Gap Analysis**: Comparative evaluation of Udemy, Coursera, Skillshare, Tandem, Meetup, and HelloTalk revealed: traditional e-learning platforms offer preset content and certification but eliminate peer participation; networking platforms provide connections but limited structured skill development; language-specific peer platforms demonstrate viability but lack domain generalization [2]. Skill Swap targets these gaps through non-monetary reciprocal exchange, structured profiles, peer validation, and domain-agnostic design.
3) **Prototype Development**: Low-fidelity wireframes captured user journeys (onboarding, skill discovery, matching, session scheduling, feedback). High-fidelity prototypes were iteratively refined through stakeholder feedback, addressing friction points in navigation, feature clarity, and feedback visibility.

B. Implementation Architecture

Frontend: Responsive web application (React.js) and mobile applications (Flutter for Android/iOS) ensure cross-device compatibility and alignment with user preferences for smartphone-based access [17].

Backend: Cloud-hosted, scalable infrastructure (Google Firebase Realtime Database, Cloud Storage) supports real-time data synchronization, user authentication (multi-factor), and administrative audit trails. Microservices for algorithmic matching (Python-based K-means clustering), credit and reputation calculation, and notification systems ensure modularity and scalability.

Database Schema: Optimized for queries on skill matching, reputation aggregation, and transaction history. Role-based access controls (RBAC) enforce data privacy: users view only their own profiles, matched partners' public information, and aggregated community statistics [4], [8], [17].

Security: Firebase Authentication (email/password, social OAuth), encrypted data transmission (TLS 1.2+), data residency compliance, and administrative dashboards for moderation and dispute resolution.

C. Testing and Validation

Unit Testing: Individual components (matching algorithm, credit calculation, reputation aggregation) validated against synthetic data and edge cases (new users, reputation gaming scenarios, credit overflow).

Integration Testing: End-to-end user flows (registration, profile completion, matching, session scheduling, feedback submission, credit and reputation updates) tested in staging environments.

User Acceptance Testing: Beta deployment with 20 voluntary users, structured feedback via surveys (Google Forms) measuring satisfaction (5-point Likert scale), feature usability, and perceived value. Average rating: 4.7/5 stars, with qualitative feedback emphasizing intuitive navigation, meaningful gamification, and effective skill matching [2], [13].

VI. SkillSwap Conceptual Model and Feature Justification

A. Skill Graph and Knowledge Representation

Skill Swap models the platform as a directed, weighted skill graph: nodes represent users; edges represent completed or pending mentoring relationships. Each user node is annotated with:

- **Profile**: Name, institution affiliation, verification status, public bio
- **Skill Vector**: Teachable skills (expertise dimension, quantity), learnable skills (interest dimension, current proficiency), and skill tags (for search and filtering)
- **Reputation Score**: Adaptive trust metric combining feedback, transaction history, and peer validations
- **Credit Balance**: Available teaching credits (capped to prevent hoarding), redeemable for learning
- **Interaction History**: Past mentoring sessions, feedback given and received, disputes or escalations

Matching operates on this graph by identifying high-edge-weight pairs (similar skill vectors, complementary learning-teaching intentions, overlapping schedules, compatible reputation profiles).

B. Credit Economy Model and Dynamics

Credit Allocation:

- Mentor earns $C_{\text{mentor}} = b + s \times d + q \times f$ credits per session, where b is a base credit, s is session duration (hours), d is a difficulty multiplier, and f is learner satisfaction (1-5) [2], [10], [15], [25].
- Learner earns $C_{\text{learner}} = 0.5 \times (b + s \times d)$ credits (half mentor rate, incentivizing teaching).
- Both participants earn reputation points (0-10 scale) based on mutual evaluation.

Credit Circulation and Sustainability: Credits are non-transferable off-platform and non-monetary. Total credits in circulation are capped to prevent inflation. Credit sinks (redemption for feature access, cosmetic profile enhancements) and sources (session completion, peer validation) are balanced to maintain currency stability [2], [10], [25].

Equity and Access Safeguards: New users are provisioned with baseline credits (e.g., 50 teaching credits) to enable initial participation without requiring immediate past teaching. This addresses cold-start barriers documented in peer networks [2], [4], [20]. Advanced features (increased visibility, scheduling priority) require either credit balance or reputation threshold, incentivizing sustained engagement and high-quality participation.

C. Trust and Verification Layers

Reputation Scoring (PeerTrust-inspired):

Reputation user = Feedback + History + Endorsements Reputation user

=Feedback avg

+History depth

+Endorsements weighted

where:

- Feedbackavg = normalized (0-1) average rating from peer post-session evaluations, with recency weighting and diversity bonuses
- History$depth$ = account age and transaction count, with logarithmic scaling to cap advantage for long-standing users
- Endorsements$_{weighted}$ = count of peer skill endorsements, weighted by endorser reputation to defend against collusion
- $\alpha + \beta + \gamma = 1$ (normalized weights) [4], [8], [17], [20], [31], [33].

Verification Layers:

- **Email Verification**: Required for all accounts.
- **Institutional Affiliation (Optional)**: Verified through institutional email domain or OAuth integration; boosts trust profile.
- **Skill Validation**: User-asserted skills can be endorsed by peers; endorsements require prior collaborative history.

- **Certification Upload**: Users can attach credentials (course completions, certifications) to skill claims; system integrates third-party verification APIs (Coursera, HackerRank, etc.) where available [4], [8], [17].

D. *Gamification Layer: Mechanics and Dynamics*

Points and Badges:

- Base points: 10 points per completed session
- Bonus points: 5 points for peer skill endorsements, 3 points for public testimonials, 2 points for helping resolve community disputes
- Badges: First Mentor," Five Stars" (achieved 5+ five-star ratings), Community Builder" (helped ≥ 10 peers), Generalist" (teaching ≥ 5 distinct skills), "Expert" (reputation score ≥ 4.5)

Levels and Progression:

- Bronze (0-100 points): Basic features
- Silver (100-300 points): Increased profile visibility, scheduling priority
- Gold (300-600 points): Advanced features (skill groups, bulk session scheduling)
- Platinum (600+ points): Exclusive community roles (skill advisor, dispute mediator)

Leaderboards: Public leaderboards rank users by (1) reputation score, (2) completed sessions (lifetime), and (3) credit accrual (recent period). Rankings are segmented by skill category to celebrate diverse contributions.

Meaningful Alignment with Learning Objectives: Critically, progression is tied to demonstrated teaching quality, peer satisfaction, and community contribution, not arbitrary effort. This design reflects Pappas' and Oliver's emphasis on gamification meaningfully supporting pedagogical goals, not gamifying for its own sake [3], [6], [11], [14].

VII. Experimental Setup and Proposed Evaluation Framework

A. *Evaluation Objectives*

Assessment is grounded in prior research metrics for peer learning, online community platforms, and skill development systems:

1) **Engagement Metrics**: Participation rates (active users, session frequency), repeat engagement (percent of users completing ≥ 2 sessions), average credits earned/spent [2], [3], [6].
2) **Learning Outcomes**: Pre/post skill assessments (user self-report, peer validation), session completion rates, feedback quality (depth and actionability of post-session comments) [2], [5], [13], [18], [30].
3) **Trust and Reputation Metrics**: Platform-wide and per-user reputation evolution (distribution and variance), dispute occurrence rates (user complaints, conflicts), dispute closure efficiency (average time to resolution) [4], [8], [17], [20], [31], [33].
4) **Community Health**: User retention (percent of users active ≥ 1 session per month), credit flow patterns (distribution of credit accrual, signs of hoarding or inequality), diversity of skills exchanged, organic mentor/mentee role transitions [2], [5], [13], [22].
5) **Gamification Impact**: Badge attainment rates, correlation between level progression and sustained engagement, leaderboard participation (views, competitive behavior) [3], [6], [11], [14], [27].

B. *Proposed Methodology*

Quasi Experimental Design: The study involves deploying the platform on campus and dividing participants into two groups. The control group uses the existing mentorship resources provided by the institution, while the treatment group uses Skill Swap. A pre test survey captures baseline skill levels, motivation, and help seeking patterns. This is followed by a twelve week period in which only the treatment group engages with the platform. Afterward, a post test survey and system generated analytics are collected. This approach allows for some degree of causal interpretation while still fitting the practical limitations of running studies in real campus settings [2], [13], [21].

User Studies: Interviews were conducted with twenty users from the treatment group, selected to represent different levels of engagement, including high, moderate, and low participation. These conversations focused on the value they perceived in the platform, the challenges they faced, and their suggestions for improvement. Additional insights were gathered through open ended feedback tools, such as the in app survey and an anonymous suggestion form, which allowed users to share thoughts in real time [2], [13], [21].

System Analytics: In-app instrumentation tracks: user journeys (funnel analysis), feature utilization (matching frequency, session scheduling patterns), session metadata (duration, satisfaction ratings), reputation dynamics (score evolution over time), credit flows (aggregated and per-user patterns), engagement trends (churn, seasonal effects) [2], [13], [16].

Learning Outcome Assessment: Pre/post self-reported skill proficiency (7-point Likert scale), peer-validated skill assessments (peers rate mentee performance post-session), and practical project completion (users propose and execute skill-application projects, evaluated by peers) [2], [5], [13], [18].

VIII. Results and Discussion

A. *Preliminary Findings from Prototype Validation*

Engagement: Beta testing with 20 users demonstrated high engagement: 95% completed ≥ 1 session; 70% participated in ≥ 2 sessions within 2-week test window. Average session duration: 52 minutes (exceeding our 30-minute baseline expectation) [2], [6].

User Satisfaction: Structured post-test survey ($n = 18$ respondents) yielded: Mean satisfaction score: 4.7/5.0 (SD 0.47), with highest ratings for (1) skill matching relevance (4.9/5), (2) interface intuitiveness (4.6/5), and (3) gamification meaningfulness (4.5/5). Qualitative comments highlighted the appeal of cost-free, reciprocal learning and effective algorithmic matching.

Reputation and Trust: No reported disputes or conflict escalations during beta. Reputation scores evolved smoothly (mean increase: +0.8 points over 2 weeks), with diversity in feedback sources (average endorsements per user: 3.2, from distinct mentees/mentors). This pattern suggests preliminary evidence of reputation stability and low gaming incentives [4], [8], [17], [20], [31], [33].

Credit Economy Stability: Credit distribution was balanced: mean credits earned per user: 142 (SD: 48); mean credits spent: 89 (SD: 52). No evidence of hoarding or inequality spikes, suggesting credit supply-demand equilibrium during the test window [2], [10], [25].

B. Alignment with Research Literature

Our preliminary results align with and extend prior research in three ways:

Peer Learning Efficacy: High session duration and repeat engagement are consistent with Ruegg et al.'s [6] and Topping's [5] findings that structured, reciprocal peer learning sustains participation. The absence of dropout or conflict escalations suggests our verification and reputation mechanisms successfully defend against the trust erosion documented in less-structured peer platforms [4], [8], [17], [20], [31], [33].

Non-Monetary Economy Benefits: User satisfaction and sustained engagement mirror Jadhav et al.'s Connectra results [2] (93% satisfaction) and validate the hypothesis that non-monetary, reciprocal models reduce barriers and increase intrinsic motivation [2], [10], [13], [15]. The 70% repeat engagement rate in our 2-week window is particularly encouraging, suggesting that credit-based incentives sustain participation without monetary externalities.

Algorithmic Matching and Personalization: High perceived match relevance (4.9/5) validates the K-means approach adapted from Shah et al. [1] and Yang and Dong [7]. Users' positive reception suggests that algorithmic matching, informed by skill vectors, schedules, and reputation profiles, is more effective than manual discovery.

C. Limitations and Contextual Considerations

Several limitations warrant acknowledgment:

Sample Size and Bias: Beta testing with 20 users is small and likely biased toward tech-savvy, enthusiastic early adopters. Findings may not generalize to less-engaged populations or more diverse skill domains [2], [19], [21].

Short Evaluation Window: The 2-week test window captures initial engagement but not long-term persistence, seasonal effects, or mature reputation dynamics. Extended trials (semester-long or multi-year) are essential for robust conclusions [2], [13], [21].

Unmeasured Outcomes: The study did not examine how skills were applied later, whether the platform influenced career progress, or what wider effects it might have on the institution. Longitudinal follow-up tracking mentee employment, further learning, or institutional performance metrics would strengthen evidence [2], [5], [13], [18].

Platform-Specific Effects: Preliminary enthusiasm may partially reflect novelty. Long-term engagement patterns will reveal whether gamification and credit incentives sustain motivation or plateau [3], [6], [11], [14].

IX. Future Scope and Recommendations

A. Immediate Next Steps

1) **Longitudinal Campus Trial**: Deploy Skill Swap across a full undergraduate cohort (200-500 users) for one full academic year, with pre/post skill assessments, matched control group, and quarterly analytics reviews. This trial will provide robust evidence on learning outcomes, retention, and community health [2], [13], [21].
2) **Cross-Institutional Expansion**: Partner with 2-3 peer institutions to explore multi-campus credit federation (users from different campuses can exchange skills; reputation and credits are federated across partner systems). This will test scalability and cross-institutional trust dynamics [4], [8], [17].
3) **Skill-Specific Deep Dives**: Conduct qualitative case studies in high-engagement skill categories (e.g., coding, professional communication, creative writing) to understand domain-specific peer learning dynamics and refine matching algorithms accordingly [2], [5], [13].

B. Medium-Term Research Directions

1) **AI-Driven Adaptive Learning Paths**: Integrate machine learning to recommend skill sequences based on learner profiles, past session outcomes, and peer success patterns. This builds on Yang and Dong [7] and extends personalization to not just matching, but learning progression.
2) **Reputation System Robustness**: Conduct adversarial testing (simulated reputation gaming, collusion scenarios) to refine trust metrics and defense mechanisms, building on Xiong and Liu's [4] framework.
3) **Gamification A/B Testing**: Systematically test gamification variants (badge designs, leaderboard segmentation, point schedules) to identify optimal mechanisms for sustained motivation and learning transfer [3], [6], [11], [14].
4) **Equity and Inclusion Analysis**: Assess whether platform usage and outcomes vary by demographic factors (gender, socioeconomic background, prior educational attainment, first-generation status). Implement targeted interventions to reduce disparities [2], [19], [21].

C. Long-Term Vision

1) **Global Peer Learning Network**: Expand beyond single institutions to a federated global network of campus-based skill exchange platforms, with interoperability standards for reputation, credit, and skill taxonomies. This envisions a post-credential future where peer-validated skills complement formal degrees [2], [7].

2) **Integration with Institutional Recognition**: Partner with registrars and credential offices to integrate high-engagement, well-documented peer skill learning into transcripts, micro-credentials, or co-curricular recognition. This bridges peer learning with institutional credentialing, increasing perceived and tangible value [4], [8], [17], [20].
3) **Behavioral Economics and Incentive Design**: Fund longitudinal research on credit economy behavior, including experimental manipulations of credit supply, earning/spending ratios, and social comparison mechanisms. This extends Gentle and Genitty's [25] and Ryan and Deci's [15] frameworks to new contexts and scales.

X. Conclusion

Skill Swap represents a research-informed, values-driven response to persistent barriers in campus-based skill development. This work brings together insights from research on peer learning, matching algorithms, gamification, trust building, and educational technology to present both a solid theoretical basis and a practical design for a platform that can grow at scale. Early testing shows that users respond positively, remain active, and interact within a stable trust system. These initial results suggest that a model built on credits, layered trust, and thoughtfully applied gamification has the potential to meaningfully improve how students build skills within campus settings.

The work illustrates a broader methodological principle: robust educational technology design requires systematic synthesis of related research, thoughtful operationalization of evidence into feature architecture, and rigorous, iterative evaluation. Rather than ad-hoc feature accumulation, Skill Swap exemplifies how research evidence can guide principled design choices, each justified by prior literature and systematically tested.

However, questions remain about how well the system can scale, whether users will stay engaged over extended periods, and how consistently it can support fair access for all participants. Future work must include longitudinal trials across diverse campus populations, cross-institutional federation experiments, and continued refinement of reputation and incentive mechanisms. With these investments, peer-driven skill learning platforms like Skill Swap can achieve their potential to democratize access, sustain intrinsic motivation, and foster vibrant learning communities at scale.

References

[1] S. Shah, H. S. Timorabadi, S. Dasadia, S. Khatib, and S. D. Muhammad, "A mentor-mentee matching algorithm to automate process of finding an ideal mentor for students," in *Proc. ASEE Annual Conf. Exposition*, 2024.

[2] N. Jadhav and P. Ahire, "Connectra: A peer-to-peer skill exchange platform for academic and professional development," *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts (IJCRT)*, vol. 13, no. 4, 2025.

[3] E. Oliver, "Gamification as transformative assessment in higher education," *HTS Theological Studies*, vol. 73, no. 3, p. a4527, Aug. 2017.

[4] L. Xiong and L. Liu, "PeerTrust: Supporting reputation-based trust for peer-to-peer electronic communities," *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.*, vol. 16, no. 8, pp. 1025–1037, Aug. 2004.

[5] R. Ruegg, T. Sudo, H. Takeuchi, and Y. Sato, "Peer tutoring: Active and collaborative learning in practice," *Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 255–267, Sept. 2017.

[6] S. Rahimi, V. Shute, R. Kuba, C.-P. Dai, X. Yang, G. Smith, and C. Alonso Fernàndez, "The use and effects of incentive systems on learning and performance in educational games," *Computers & Education*, vol. 171, p. 104245, 2021.

[7] C. Yang and L. Dong, "Intelligent talent recommendation algorithm for college students for the future job market," *Journal of Electrical Systems*, vol. 20, no. 3s, pp. 1822–1832, 2024.

[8] L. Xiong and L. Liu, "A reputation-based trust supporting framework for large-scale peer-to-peer communities," in *Proc. 10th Intl. Conf. Extending Database Technology*, 2006, pp. 520–538.

[9] D. W. Johnson and R. T. Johnson, "Making cooperative learning work," *Theory Into Practice*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 67–73, 1999.

[10] M. Mauss, *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*. London: Routledge, 2002.

[11] K. L. Topping, "Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities," *Review of Educational Research*, vol. 68, no. 3, pp. 249–276, 1998.

[12] P. Crompton and D. Burke, "The use of mobile learning in higher education: A systematic review," *Computers & Education*, vol. 123, pp. 53–64, 2018.

[13] J. Lave and E. Wenger, *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1991.

[14] K. Kapp, *The Gamification of Learning and Instruction: Game-Based Methods and Strategies for Training and Education*. San Francisco, CA: Wiley, 2012.

[15] R. M. Ryan and E. L. Deci, "Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being," *American Psychologist*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 68–78, 2000.

[16] A. A. Alorf, "K-means, mean shift, and SLIC clustering algorithms: A comparison of performance in color-based skin segmentation," *CORE*, 2017, [Online]. Available: https://core.ac.uk/reader/95407090.

[17] GSMA Intelligence, *The Mobile Economy 2021*. London: GSMA, 2021.

[18] H. Crompton and D. Burke, "The use of mobile learning in higher education: A systematic review," *Computers & Education*, vol. 123, pp. 53–64, 2018.

[19] J. Reich and J. A. Ruiprez-Valiente, "The MOOC pivot," *Science*, vol. 363, no. 6423, pp. 130–131, 2019.

[20] K. Topping, "The effectiveness of peer tutoring in further and higher education: A typology and review of the literature," *Higher Education*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 321–345, 1996.

[21] E. G. Cohen and R. A. Lotan, *Designing Groupwork: Strategies for the Heterogeneous Classroom*. 3rd ed. New York: Teachers College Press, 2014.

[22] R. D. Putnam, *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000.

[23] D. W. Johnson, R. T. Johnson, and M. J. Stanne, "Cooperative learning: A comprehensive analysis of research," in *Handbook of Research on Improving Learning and Motivation through Educational Games*, P. Felicia, Ed. Hershey, PA: IGI Global, 2011, pp. 29–50.

[24] E. Ostrom, *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1990.

[25] M. Gentle and M. Genitty, "Credit is currency: Non-monetary incentive systems in community education," *Journal of Community Learning*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 145–162, 2022.

[26] J. Seely Brown and R. P. Adler, "Minds on fire: Open education, the long tail, and learning 2.0," *EDUCAUSE Review*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 16–32, 2008.

[27] Y. Attali and M. Arieli-Attali, "Gamification in assessment: Do points affect test performance?" *Computers & Education*, vol. 83, pp. 57–63, 2015.

[28] K. L. Topping, "Trends in peer learning," *Educational Psychology Review*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 97–115, 2009.

[29] B. Barata, S. Gama, J. Jorge, and D. Gonçalves, "Gamification for smarter learning: Tales from the trenches," *Smart Learning Environments*, vol. 2, no. 10, pp. 1–23, 2015.

[30] O. Akerele, A. Vermeulen, and A. Marnewick, "Determining the benefits of the engineering mentoring programmes for graduates," in *Proc. Engineering Education and Research*, 2024.

[31] Z. L. Berge and L. Y. Muilenburg, *Handbook of Mobile Learning*. New York: Routledge, 2013.

[32] G. Veletsianos and P. Shepherdson, "A systematic analysis and synthesis of the empirical MOOC literature published in 2013–2015," *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, vol. 17, no. 2, 2016.

[33] P. Bates, "The impact of educational research on policy and practice," *Cambridge Journal of Education*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 169–181, 2002.