

TEACHING MATERIALS FROM OPEN EDUCATIONAL RESOURCE (OER) PLATFORM: HO ARE THEY DEVELOPED?

Nur Iffah Muchallidah Isnaini and Ahmad Munir

Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Surabaya

nur.22010@mhs.unesa.ac.id

Abstract: The emerge of Open Educational Resource (OER) platforms is widely spreading and quickly growing across nations in the past few decades. All the more, since it has been issued by UNESCO's mandate in 2019. It becomes a real embodiment of effort in creating sustainable educational atmosphere, more particularly in terms of teaching and learning resource. A developing country, such as Indonesia also livens it up, either platforms developed by the government officially or by other educational institutions. One of the crucial challenges is on the quality of those teaching and learning resource. Therefore, this study examines the contents of teaching materials obtained from government OER platform. There are one textbook and four teaching modules analyzed in depth. The book is analyzed using two main instruments: the first is major principles in materials development and the second is the frameworks for developing ELT materials for each language skill and language components. Meanwhile the teaching module is analyzed using the first instrument only. The finding shows that they are lack of authentic materials, less focusing both on form and meaning, and less contain creativity stimulus.

Keywords: Open Educational Resource (OER), Material Development, ELT

INTRODUCTION

Large numbers of teaching materials are growing marvelously nowadays. International awareness of sharing educational resource openly is increasing more since UNESCO endorsed The Recommendation on Open Educational Resource (OER) in General Conference on 25 November 2019 during its 40th session. It is the first international normative instrument to include the field of publicly licensed educational resources and technologies. It's in accordance with one of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development Goals 4 (quality education). Actually, OER is now a new thing. It's already well-known since early 2010's. Therefore, there are so many definitions in explaining what OER is.

Open Educational Resources (OER) are items that are freely available and openly licensed for use in teaching, learning, and research. Textbooks, lecture notes, syllabi, multimedia content, simulations, quizzes, and any other educational items that can enhance learning are examples of resources (Wiley, Bliss, & McEwen, 2013). The main feature of OER is that they are distributed under an open license, usually a Creative Commons license, which allows users to freely access, use, change, and share the materials. This openness has significant advantages since it allows educators and learners to adapt and customize resources to meet their individual requirements without legal or financial constraints. In education, OER promote the values of cooperation, diversity, and affordability. They are made by educators, professionals, and institutions who freely share their knowledge and instructional materials with the rest of the world. OER improve access to education by making high-quality educational resources freely available, particularly for persons who may not have the financial means to purchase traditional textbooks or resources.

Furthermore, open educational resources (OER) support innovation and the creation of new teaching and learning approaches (Coughlan, Pitt, & Farrow, 2018). Educators can alter and remix OER to produce customized materials that fit their teaching methods and meet the specific needs of their students. This adaptability enables a more customized and engaging learning experience. OER have grown in popularity and acceptance by educational institutions, governments, and citizens worldwide. They have the potential to transform education by making high-quality learning resources available to all, encouraging collaboration and knowledge sharing, and allowing learners and educators to actively participate in the development and dissemination of educational materials.

A huge number of institutions and organizations are seemingly vying to provide OER platform as the real contribution for educational responsibilities. According to studies on teachers' perceptions of OERs, using them may boost student productivity by enhancing their confidence, interest, and contentment with the task at hand. Furthermore, its utilization encourages instructors to engage in reflective practice (Pérez-Paredes, Guillaón, & Jiménez, 2018).

OERs can be found all over the internet, but it may be easier to find them in an OER database, such as OER Commons (oercommons.org), MERLOT (merlot.org), or Teaching Commons (teachingcommons.us). Because the same resources are frequently featured in all three databases, instructors may concentrate on learning to use only one (Burrows, Staley, & Burrows, 2022). Even though there are many OER platforms, this does not eliminate the challenges at the practical level.

According to the study held in Kenya, some of the problems encountered in the adoption and usage of OERs in Kenyan schools include insufficient infrastructure, unfavourable attitudes, a lack of ICT competences, and other skill gaps among instructors, as well as a lack of administrative support (Orwenjo & Erastus, 2018). From the perspective of students' learning, OER materials have a large positive effect on both international students and Pell Grant qualified students yet OER materials do not, in general, cause any major change in student final exam performance (Delgado, Delgado, and Hilton III, 2019). However, there are many researchers focusing on the exposure of OER superiorities applied in classroom practice. A study with big scale participants and rich collaborations held in USA resulted some highlighted benefits of OER in teaching practice (Weller, Martin, et al, 2015). Firstly, there is a benefit to educators' reflection on practice that comes with OER adoption. Second, the use of OERs by students to supplement or replace formal education has benefits for both students and institutions, as it has the potential to increase retention, performance, and recruitment, albeit a full longitudinal study would be required to determine whether these affects are observed. Finally, the financial benefits, which have been extensively investigated, were evident in findings. Beyond financial savings, several students remarked that having immediate access to the content was helpful, as it was common practice to wait until a course had begun to determine whether a costly textbook was worth purchasing. Being able to presume that all kids had access to the resource was also cited as advantageous by educators. Furthermore, one of the key advantages of integrating OER is that the resources may be altered and remixed; they can be tailored to match the undergraduates' learning objectives or requirements (Sandanyake, 2019). Students also get free access to their course materials if a course makes use of open educational resources. OER materials can also be utilized again and again by teachers, negating traditional copyright or other legal restrictions.

In English Language Teaching (ELT) context, the emergence of OER can assist both teachers and students to be exposed to authentic input. Learners can access authentic resources and participate in real-life scenarios. They also can read authentic texts and view and listen to authentic programs using e-learning tools. The need for culturally acceptable authentic

material has become more acute. This study discovered that authentic and culturally appropriate resources are critical in teaching a foreign/second language. They supplement traditional lessons and can be quite engaging for students (Ahmed, 2017). Another point that OER takes important part in ELT is that OER for language learning provides learners with equal access to language learning materials. They also promote life-long language learning. Besides, OER enable teachers to collaborate with colleagues all around the world. OER also assist language teachers to increase their teaching quality. Teachers can discover items that best match the requirements of their students and then encourage them to use them. Using OER helps raise language teachers' understanding of new technology and methods to language instruction (Altunay, 2013).

However, the quality of OER for ELT resource is really needed. Especially for countries which English is as foreign language. The teachers have two big homework in implementing best teaching material. Firstly, it is related to the quality of the teaching resource related to how ELT material should be developed based on a good principal and framework. Secondly, it is due to the appropriateness to their teaching circumstances, whether it is in line to their norms and values, cultural beliefs, and others. Thus, this research focuses on the first issue in accordance with the quality of teaching resource obtained from OER platform. How teaching materials obtained from OER platform are developed, whether they can meet the major principles and frameworks in developing ELT materials or not is noteworthy to discuss since those textbooks are utilized in most schools nationally and become one of standard among of quandary situations during curriculum transitions.

METHOD

This research applies content analysis qualitative study. Based on Shava (2021), in Qualitative Content Analysis (QCA), there is mention of an integrated view of voice or text and their specific circumstances, which allows academics to understand social reality subjectively but scientifically. He also stated that if written text is the primary source of data, it is a non-intrusive strategy because no undesired interaction effects occur between participants and researchers. The instruments used is the major principles and frameworks of developing ELT materials. That is a synthesized summary of well-known books used in any ELT course.

For major principles, there are 8 statements highlighted. They are related to the authenticity, form focus, meaning focus, balance of all language aspects, target language utility, attractiveness, needs and differences of the learners, and the materials used. For the framework, there is one framework for each language skill and one framework for language components. Those instruments were adapted from Munir (2020).

The teaching resource analyzed here are all obtained from government OER platform that is nationally well-known and believed as the most used platform as teaching practice reference. At the time of this research, the number of available textbooks in the OER platform is four, namely for Grade 2, 5, 10, and 11. Books for Grade 2 and 5 have the same authors, so the researchers chose the one for Grade 5, called Textbook 1. Textbook 1 consists of 10 units and was published in 2021 right after the new curriculum began to be implemented. Besides textbooks, the OER platform also provides teaching modules. The main distinction between textbook and module is on the number of the chapters. Textbook has chapters for a 1 year period (full meetings and complete language skills), yet module only contain a single chapter (usually 1 meeting and one language skill). Teaching modules in Indonesia also contain some administrative things in teaching, such as learning objectives, learning preparation, detailed steps in learning activities for each meeting, assessment instruments, and some others. All of them are stated in Bahasa Indonesia and will not be analyzed in this research.

The textbook here is analyzed using all instruments, since it contains full units for 1 year period of teaching with all language skills and components. Meanwhile, the teaching modules here are analyzed only using 1 instrument that is major principles of ELT materials development. Because they only have one chapter which usually contain 1 meeting material (not all language skills are taught).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

English Student Book Grade 5

The textbook analysed here is English student book for primary school grade 5. It contains 10 chapters with 124 total pages. Before analysing deeper, a quick review was done to check the grammatical errors. The result shows that the textbook has 2 main grammatical errors. They are on page 39 and 66. On page 39, there is “Look and say” part, which asks the students to say the sentences based on the pictures (comic). One of the dialogue box states, “I have a headache. It’s really hurts.” It should be, “I have a headache. It really hurts.” On page 66, in “Look and write” to be precise, the students are asked to write a short story based on the picture given. It consists of 2 pictures and picture number 1 was already done as an example. Picture 1 has 5 simple sentences and two of them contain solecism by stating “two deers” and “The elephant eats the grass uses his trunk”. Actually, those grammatical errors must be avoided by the students because they think that what is inside the book is true. The detailed analyses results are explained after each table.

Table 1. Analyses Result based on Major Principles of Materials Development -Textbook 1

No	Based on Major Principles of materials development	Results of analyses					Notes
		SD	D	U	A	SA	
1	The materials use authentic texts as models	v					There are no authentic texts found in all chapters
2	The materials focus on form		v				Grammar tasks are commonly delivered by completing missing sentences
3	The materials focus on meaning		v				The language used is less natural and less meaningful
4	The materials have various and balance all the language aspects			v			The major focus is on semantics (sentence completion) which is inversely proportioned with phonology, pragmatics and morphology)
5	The materials are flexible				v		The materials given are flexible since it has some activities with less grip instructions
6	The materials use L2 (target language)					v	All materials are delivered in English (except students’ feedback table is presented in Indonesian Language)

7	The materials are engaging, stimulating and interesting			v		The graphics and illustrations are great, but all of them are presented in cartoon (no real photograph at all)
8	The materials consider the learners' needs and differences		v			Most texts focus on read/write learning style
9	The materials use written, spoken, and multi-modal texts with the potential to engage them affectively and cognitively	v				There are no recorded audio inputs, short written text only.

The analyses results which are based on major principles of materials development show that the book is lack of authentic materials. All texts used in the books are made for language learning purposively instead of communicative purpose for real-life needs. It possibly bothers students to integrate what they have learned in the school and what they might find in real-life context. Seeing that the use of authentic materials in language instruction is backed by a substantial body of literature, these resources seem to be successful at inspiring students, pepping their interest, and exposing them to the language they will actually encounter in the real world. Furthermore, by exposing pupils to real-world language, these tools help them succeed in learning a foreign language (Namaziandost, Razmi, Tilwani, & Gilakjani, 2021). Indeed, the book was made specially for Indonesian young learners at the age of 10-12 years old. The authors perhaps intended to make them imagine if their closest surroundings are in English so that the learners can simply deliver their opinions in English language, not English way. For example, to learn how to say price of some food and beverage, the book uses single picture of traditional food instead of a real set of restaurant menu. Another example is when the book presents a conversation about comparing things. There are some uncommon expressions used, so that it is still correct grammatically, but not pragmatically. Since it has some issues in authenticity, it directly impacts on another principle, that materials focus on meaning. The essence is that the language used should be meaningful, natural, and useful (Hadfield in Maley, 2016).

Another point is that the book does not utilize spoken and multi-modal texts to engage students actively and cognitively. There are no recorded audio texts at all, so that the only spoken texts are from their teachers who read some parts aloud classically. The next highlight is that the major focus style of the textbook is read/write learning style. Most tasks ask the students to do sentence completion in written form based on simple instructions. Thus, the materials do not balance all the language aspects, especially in phonology, pragmatics, and morphology. Since there are no authentic recorded audio inputs, the students are not given access to the natural model of English speakers. Even, the textbook does not provide phonological aspects such as how to pronounce topic-words correctly. The next point related to this case is that the materials less consider the learners' needs and differences. As we know, young learners are more likely interested in kinesthetics and audio-visual source rather than monotonous activity, in this textbook is read/write style.

Analyses Result based on Frameworks for developing listening materials -Textbook 1

Almost all texts in the book use short and simple written text (not more than 4 simple sentences). The spoken text source is only from the teacher as the only model to read some words or sentences aloud. It can be implied that there is no integration between spoken and

written language skill since the activities mostly ask the students to match or circle the correct picture based on what the teacher says. As stated before, there are no authentic recordings at all in the textbook so the students cannot access the real English speaker as a model. Whereas, using authentic content as media has a huge impact on raising kids' listening achievement (Siregar & Manurung, 2020).

The materials also provide less types of listening activities depending on learner proficiency levels. Among of 10 chapters, only 4 of them provide listening activities, they are 1 activity in chapter 1 which is listen and match, 2 activities in chapter 4 which are listen and circle and listen and answer, 1 activity in chapter 5 which is listen and circle, and 2 activities in chapter 10 which are listen and write and listen and say. What we have to underline in the very first place here is that all listening source is from the teacher her/himself. Most activities are followed by simple instruction such as circle and match the picture given in the textbook. Moreover, there are no listening activities in chapter 2, 3, 6,7, and 9.

For the good parts, the listening materials given need students' responses and focus on learning objectives. The students' responses are some in written form and some in oral form (read aloud).

Analyses Result based on Frameworks for developing speaking materials -Textbook 1

The session "Look and say" in the book means that the students are asked to read aloud what they see or read in the books (pictures, words, and simple sentences). Thus, it does not belong to speaking activities. Actually, there are 12 parts which are meant to be speaking activities. They are on page 8, 9, 18, 30, 43, 49, 70, 71, 81, 90, 93, and 103. However, it's unfortunately said that they have unclear instructions. 5 of them need additional cards to do because the instruction states to take the cards and students should make a simple conversation based on the pictures printed on the cards. Otherwise, there are no cards found or attached in the whole textbook. There is also 1 activity with very unclear direction. It's stated to play whispering game but there is no what and how to do in the game. The rest activities are about describing objects around and make written reports. Again, even the simple instruction is stated but the sample activity is not existed. It could make the students are very dependent to their teacher in explaining more the detailed activities.

Analyses Result based on Frameworks for developing reading materials -Textbook 1

Most reading activities in the textbook 1 are in the form of reading aloud instead of reading comprehension. The reading texts should be authentic texts, yet there are no ones in the book. Many written texts which are meant to be reading activities are conversational text with no more than 4 simple sentences long.

The vocabulary building is actually emphasized by asking the students to read the picture followed by written words. Most activities are made to drill and rehearsed dialogues. Yet, the bottom-up process is less seen since no decoding skills found. There are no phonological aspects that emphasize how to pronounce words correctly. Additionally, the vocabularies are taught as a phrase with representative picture that can help students to relate to their surroundings, but most of them are not made meaningfully in a form of authentic expressions.

The prior knowledge is involved in most reading activities because the book chooses to present local objects that might be familiar for the students. The most vocabularies used are also the high frequency ones. It really suits to the target users, who are young learners. The schemata concept is strong due to the good graphics presented in the book. All representative pictures are clear and well-designed.

Analyses Result based on Frameworks for developing writing materials – Textbook 1

Writing tasks in this book are dominantly guided by interesting illustrations that might attract students' motivation to complete all activities. Most topics are delivered with very-local

objects and setting which result no cultural inappropriateness issues. The tasks are also integrated to the students' surroundings which enable to give good stimulus in doing writing tasks and build their confidence since the topic is about things they discover. Unluckily, authentic texts are not provided so it only focuses on local topics instead of global ones. Types of writing tasks in this book is less varied. They mostly ask the students to do sentence completion and make written report based on what they discover in the given tables. For example, to report a friends' general information of their physical appearance, the students only write the height, weight, and age in each column. As happened in speaking activities, the clear examples of relevant language used are less given. It also has no supplementary materials and no writing strategies, whereas, those things could assist students to think, create, and generate their ideas into simple writing outputs.

Analyses Result based on Frameworks for developing language components materials – Textbook 1

A paper's finding indicated that teachers were prevented from teaching pronunciation due to a lack of time, motivation, resources, materials, and educational facilities such as computer technologies. If teachers want to include pronunciation in their classes, they should be equipped with these factors that can increase their success in teaching English pronunciation (Gilakjani and Sabouri, 2016). Therefore, if there are no pronunciation materials found in a learning source, the teacher might not present how to make sounds correctly in classrooms. While, how vocabulary materials are constructed are nailing so they can be perfect if followed by pronunciation practice. The second finding that is no less important than pronunciation is grammar materials. Young learners tend to duplicate what they learn and acquire. This book has good examples in many sentences in delivering grammar materials, yet they are not followed by clear explanations. Actually, its readers might be more confused if grammar activities are followed by clear explanations.

Teaching Modules

Some teaching modules downloaded for the OER platform are chosen because of their availabilities. At the time of this research, many teaching modules mentioned in the platform are not available to download due to some technical issues, such as corrupted files, not-downloadable files, and different file names but having the same exact contents. The 4 most available modules are selected and explained in table 6.

Table 2. Teaching Modules General Information

No.	Topic	Grade	Author	Designation in this study
1	Suggestions & Offers, Opinions & Thoughts	11	English Education Undergraduate Students	TM 1
2	Recount Text	10	English Education Undergraduate Students	TM 2
3	Daily Routines	7	English Teacher	TM 3
4	My Schedule	7	English Teacher	TM 4

In the platform, the teaching modules are made by not only professional teachers, but also undergraduate students in English Education major. All of them have different layouts and displays because the platform does not require the teaching materials uploaded to have the same layout or format. The analyses results are given in table 7.

Table 3. Teaching Modules Analyses Results based On Major Principles of Materials Development in ELT

No	Based on Major Principles of materials development	Results of analyses				
		SD	D	U	A	SA
1	The materials use authentic texts as models		TM1	TM2, TM4	TM3	
2	The materials focus on form			TM1, TM4	TM2, TM4	
3	The materials focus on meaning		TM1, TM2, TM3			
4	The materials have various and balance all the language aspects	TM3	TM1	TM4	TM2	
5	The materials are flexible	TM3		TM2	TM1	TM4
6	The materials use L2 (target language)			TM2	TM1, TM3	TM4
7	The materials are engaging, stimulating and interesting		TM3	TM1, TM2		TM4
8	The materials consider the learners' needs and differences		TM3	TM1, TM2		TM4
9	The materials use written, spoken, and multi-modal texts with the potential to engage them affectively and cognitively	TM3	TM1		TM2	TM4

The authors of TM 1 and 2 are from the same institution, perhaps that is the reason why they have the same layout and format. The fact that the teaching materials which are made by undergraduate students and uploaded in the national OER platform is something to appreciate. The teacher-made teaching materials have some obvious distinctions compared to the non- ones. They contain more administrative things than the teaching materials themselves. Probably, it is related to their professional environment since each school usually has its own characteristics in developing a set of modules.

Most texts in TM 1 are less authentic because they are made for teaching language intentionally instead of adopting or adapting from real-world contexts. For example, the texts have some errors in grammar and are not suitable to publish for the public, thus it focuses less on meaning. The materials do not provide any spoken texts, written text only. TM 2 also has the same issues in providing authentic texts as TM 1, but it is better in delivering all language aspects. The input spoken text is also given even if it is in the form of attached links. However, both of them have less stimulus and interesting materials to catch students' engagements. Another lack is that in vocabulary glossaries, they apply English-Indonesia translation in interpreting topic words.

TM 3 and TM 4 provide authentic materials but they are less. Most texts are adapted from online resources related to topics discussed, but for language learning. TM 3 only has 1 page material; the rest pages are about other things such as a very long assessment instrument and very detailed learning activities. On the contrary, TM 4 has a complete set of chapter with many tasks and activities. It also has many attached links as learning references which are accessible for students to learn independently. Another difference is in the design, TM 4 has more illustrative pictures that may stimulate the students to think in indirect guidance than TM

3. Since TM 3 only contains a single page of teaching materials, surely it has no balance in delivering all language aspects and it is not a flexible one.

CONCLUSIONS

Teaching materials are crucial since they act as a learning source to aim whether the learning objectives could be achieved or not. Coursebooks frequently dictate the objectives, subject matter, and instructional strategies that teachers employ. The textbook offers a roadmap that outlines the basic topic of lessons and a feeling of structure that brings consistency to both individual lessons and a full course for teachers and students (Richards, 2014). Therefore, the OER platform should have certain requirements in providing teaching materials which are developed based on current theories and practices.

Another unstated challenge in obtaining teaching resources from the OER platform in this research is the technical issues during the downloading process, such corrupted files, incomplete content, different file names yet same content, and sudden unavailability. Teachers with less persistence will probably not visit the platform anymore due to poor experience.

For the ELT materials development point of view, most teaching materials have issues in providing authentic materials which result in less meaningful focus. Besides, the language aspects are still lacking in the phonological aspect. The vocabulary building is not equipped with clear pronunciation practice, yet translation only, even in L1 interpretation. The text inputs are also dominantly given in written. The least number of authentic spoken materials is also the problem. Most of them ask the teacher to be the model for spoken inputs.

By those conclusions, therefore, both the OER platform stakeholders and the content creators who are the teachers in this case, should be consistently aware and careful of providing qualified OER needs.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, S. (2017). Authentic ELT materials in the language classroom: An overview. *Journal of applied linguistics and language research*, 4(2), 181-202.
- Altunay, D. (2013). The role of open educational resources in english language learning and teaching. *International Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching (IJCALLT)*, 3(2), 97-107.
- Burrows, K. M., Staley, K., & Burrows, M. (2022). The Potential of Open Educational Resources for English Language Teaching and Learning: From Selection to Adaptation. In *English Teaching Forum* (Vol. 60, No. 2, pp. 2-9). US Department of State. Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Office of English Language Programs, SA-5, 2200 C Street NW 4th Floor, Washington, DC 20037.
- Coughlan, T., Pitt, R., & Farrow, R. (2019). Forms of innovation inspired by open educational resources: a post-project analysis. *Open Learning: The Journal of Open, Distance and e-Learning*, 34(2), 156-175.
- Delgado, H., Delgado, M., & Hilton III, J. (2019). On the efficacy of open educational resources: Parametric and nonparametric analyses of a university calculus class. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 20(1).
- Gilakjani, A. P., & Sabouri, N. B. (2016). Learners' Listening Comprehension Difficulties in English Language Learning: A Literature Review. *English language teaching*, 9(6), 123-133.
- Maley, A. (2016). Principles and procedures in materials development. In *Issues in materials development* (pp. 11-29). Brill.
- Namaziandost, E., Razmi, M. H., Ahmad Tilwani, S., & Pourhosein Gilakjani, A. (2022). The impact of authentic materials on reading comprehension, motivation, and anxiety among Iranian male EFL learners. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 38(1), 1-18.

- Orwenjo, D. O., & Erastus, F. K. (2018). Challenges of adopting open educational resources (OER) in Kenyan Secondary Schools: The case of open resources for english language teaching (ORELT). *Journal of Learning for Development*, 5(2), 148-162.
- Pérez-Paredes, P., Ordoñana Guillamón, C., & Aguado Jiménez, P. (2018). Language teachers' perceptions on the use of OER language processing technologies in MALL. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 31(5-6), 522-545.
- Richards, J. C. (2014). The ELT textbook. *International perspectives on materials in ELT*, 19-36.
- Sandanayake, T. C. (2019). Promoting open educational resources-based blended learning. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 16(1), 1-16.
- Shava, G. N., Hleza, S., Tlou, F., Shonhiwa, S., & Mathonsi, E. (2021). Qualitative content analysis utility, usability and processes in educational research. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 5(7), 553-558.
- Shava, G. N., Hleza, S., Tlou, F., Shonhiwa, S., & Mathonsi, E. (2021). Qualitative content analysis utility, usability and processes in educational research. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 5(7), 553-558.
- Weller, M., De los Arcos, B., Farrow, R., Pitt, B., & McAndrew, P. (2015). The impact of OER on teaching and learning practice. *Open Praxis*, 7(4), 351-361. Weller, M., De los Arcos, B., Farrow, R., Pitt, B., & McAndrew, P. (2015). The impact of OER on teaching and learning practice. *Open Praxis*, 7(4), 351-361.
- Wiley, D., Bliss, T. J., & McEwen, M. (2014). Open educational resources: A review of the literature. *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology*, 781-789.