

Identifying Categories of Open Educational Resource Users

Martin Weller, Rob Farrow, Rebecca Pitt,
Beatriz de los Arcos, Patrick McAndrew
The Open University, UK



ABSTRACT

The open educational resource (OER) movement has been successful in developing a large, global community of practitioners, in releasing high-quality learning material and influencing policy. It now stands at the cusp of mainstream adoption, which will require reaching different audiences than previously. In this article, the findings of the OER ResearchHub are used to identify three categories of OER users: OER active, OER facilitator, and OER consumer. These groups have different requirements of OER and thus varying strategies would be required to meet their needs if mainstream adoption was to be realized.

Keywords: open educational resource, OER, users, categories

Identificando categorías de usuarios de recursos educativos abiertos

RESUMEN

El movimiento de recursos educativos abiertos (OER) ha tenido éxito en el desarrollo de una gran comunidad global de profesionales, en la publicación de material de aprendizaje de alta calidad y en influenciar políticas. Ahora se encuentra en la cúspide de la adopción generalizada, lo que requerirá llegar a audiencias diferentes a las anteriores. En este artículo los hallazgos del OER ResearchHub se usan para identificar tres categorías de usuarios de OER: activo de OER, facilitador de OER y consumidor de OER. Estos grupos tienen diferentes requisitos de OER y, por lo tanto, se requerirían diferentes estrategias para satisfacer sus necesidades si se realizara la adopción general.

Palabras clave: recursos de educación abierta, OER, usuarios, categorías

确定开放教育资源的用户类别

摘要

开放教育资源(OER)运动已经成功地开发了一个庞大的、全球性从业者社区，发布了高质量的学习材料并影响了政策发展。目前它正处于主流采纳的尖端，这将需要接触到与以前不同的受众。在本文论述中，OER研究中心的发现被用于识别三类OER用户：OER激活者、OER促进者和OER消费者。这些群体对OER有各自不同的要求。因此，如果要想实现采纳主流化，就需要采取不同的战略来满足它们的需求。

关键词：开放教育资源，OER，用户，类别

Introduction

Open educational resources (OERs) have been part of the open education movement since 2002, with the advent of MIT's OpenCourseWare project. The history of OER goes back further than this if one considers the Learning Object developments of the 1990s and emergence of openly licensed software as precursors. Their premise is a relatively simple one and has remained largely unchanged since the initial MIT project: creating educational content with an open license so it can be accessed freely and adapted. The Hewlett Foundation's definition of an OER is:

[...] teaching, learning, and research resources that reside in the public domain or have been released under an intellectual property license that permits their free use and re-purposing by others. Open educational resources include full courses, course materials, modules, textbooks, streaming videos, tests, software, and any other tools, materials, or techniques used to support access to knowledge. [Hewlett Foundation (n.d.)]

This gives a clear definition of OER, but for many practitioners, this becomes blurred in practice, and overlaps with any online resource, regardless of license. Although this study focuses primarily with OER as defined here, this mixed economy is part of the practice of users, and so is reflected in some of the later discussion.

The OER movement has been something of a success story compared with many educational developments, for instance, the aforementioned learning objects, which gained a good deal of initial attention. There is a global OER movement, with repositories in most major languages. Funding has been provided by foundations such as Hewlett and national bodies such as JISC in the UK, and sustainable models that do not require external funding have begun to emerge, for example, the Open University's OpenLearn project (Perryman, Law, & Law, 2013). It is difficult to quantify OERs by time or projects, since it will vary depending on definition, but Creative Commons have estimated there are over one billion CC licensed resources (Creative Commons, 2015).

For example, should online collections from museums be included? Or more general resources such as YouTube videos, SlideShare presentations, iTunes U downloads? Even if the focus is solely on university-based OER projects then there is considerable output, with the Open Education Consortium listing over 200 institutional members, all of whom have a commitment to open education and releasing OERs (Open Education Consortium, 2015). MIT has now made over 2,000 courses freely available (MIT OCW, 2015) and the Open University's OpenLearn site has released over 10,000 hours of learning resources.

One major development in OERs over this period has been the advent of open textbooks, although these repre-

sent just one form of OER. The premise of open textbooks is relatively simple—create electronic versions of standard textbooks that are openly licensed and freely available and can be modified by users. The physical versions of such books are available at a low cost to cover printing, for as little as \$5 USD (Wiley, 2011). The motivations for developing open textbooks are particularly evident in the United States, where the cost of textbooks accounts for 26% of a four-year degree program (Government Accounts Office, 2005). This creates a strong economic argument for their adoption in higher education, and a similar case can be made at the K12 level.

There are a number of projects developing open textbooks using various models of production. A good example is OpenStax, who have funding from several foundations to develop open textbooks targeting the subject areas with large national student populations, for example, “Introductory Statistics,” “Concepts of Biology,” “Introduction to Sociology,” etc. The books are co-authored and authors are paid a fee to work on the books, which are peer-reviewed. The electronic versions are free, and print versions available at cost. The books are released under a CC BY license, and educators are encouraged to modify the textbooks to suit their own needs. In terms of adoption, the OpenStax textbooks have been downloaded over 120,000 times and 200 institutions have decided to formally adopt OpenStax materials, leading to an estimated savings of over \$30 million in a little

over two years (OpenStax College, 2014).

The OER movement has managed to grow substantially over the past decade. It has released a vast amount of educational material, and seen diverse implementation projects across the globe. The OER movement has gone through different phases, from startup to growth and, in places, sustainability. This has happened in parallel with a number of related developments in the open education movement, namely the success of open access publishing, particularly through national mandates (SPARC, 2015), and the more recent popular attention garnered by MOOCs. Education policy has also started to recognize the potential of OER, for example, the U.S. Department of Labor launched a \$2 billion program, Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College and Career Training (TAAC-CCT), aimed at improving workforce and employability training. All new materials produced through these grants were mandated to release their content under a Creative Commons license (Allen, 2016). This has created a context in which the OER movement views the next phase as one of becoming mainstream in educational practice.

For example, the Hewlett Foundation White Paper (2013) on OERs states that its goal is “to pave the way towards mainstream adoption of OER in a manner that promotes greater, sustainable educational capacity,” and the theme of the 2015 OER conference in the UK was “mainstreaming open education” (OER Conference, 2015).

In order for OERs to enter the mainstream of educational practice, their use by learners, educators, and policymakers would need to become common practice; the default option. The broad approach of the OER movement thus far has been to increase OER awareness and to grow the OER community. However, for mainstream adoption, it may be that other approaches are now required and what was a successful strategy in one stage of development may not be successful in another. This may not have been an overarching, or deliberate strategy, but reflects the manner in which movements develop. This study examines different forms of engagement with OER, using the research of a project based at the Open University, the OER Research Hub, as the basis for proposing three forms of engagement. By understanding these types of engagement, strategy for OER adoption can be influenced.

The OER Research Hub

The OER Research Hub (<http://oerhub.net>) was a project funded by the Hewlett Foundation, which commenced in 2012. The aim of the project was to create an evidence base for the OER community. Much of the initial phase of the OER movement can be characterized as being belief-driven about the potential benefits of OERs. These beliefs might be stated as obvious, undeniably true, or based on anecdote, but rarely backed up by evidence. This was because the movement had to gain sufficient momentum to have evidence to investigate wheth-

er this potential was realized. The OER movement may now have realized this critical mass of evidence needed to investigate these more fully. The OER Research Hub set out to establish this evidence base, using 11 hypotheses, which represented the commonly stated beliefs and claims in the OER community:

A Performance: Use of OER leads to improvement in student performance and satisfaction.

B Openness: The Open Aspect of OER creates different usage and adoption patterns than other online resources.

C Access: Open education models lead to more equitable access to education, serving a broader base of learners than traditional education.

D Retention: Use of OER is an effective method for improving retention for at-risk students.

E Reflection: Use of OER leads to critical reflection by educators, with evidence of improvement in their practice.

F Finance: OER adoption at an institutional level leads to financial benefits for students and/or institutions.

G Indicators: Informal learners use a variety of indicators when selecting OER.

H Support: Informal learners adopt a variety of techniques to compensate for the lack of formal support, which can be supported in open courses

I Transition: Open education acts as a bridge to formal education, and is complementary, not competitive, with it.

J Policy: Participation in OER pilots and programs leads to policy change at

an institutional level.

K Assessment: Informal means of assessment are motivators for learning with OER.

Methodology

The authors adopted a mixed methods approach. In addition to gathering existing evidence onto an evidence map (oermap.org), the project worked with 15 different collaborations, across four sectors: K12, 2 community colleges, higher education, and informal learning. Interviews, case studies, and quantitative data were gathered, but this paper largely reports on responses to surveys. Sets of survey questions were created, addressing the 11 hypotheses. Although slight variations were permitted depending on context, the same pool of questions was used across a wide range of respondents. These included students in formal education, informal learners, educators at K12, community college and higher education level, and librarians. In total, 21 surveys were distributed, with nearly 7,500 responses.

The collaborations were as follows:

- ❑ **The Flipped Learning Network (FLN)**
- ❑ **Vital Signs**
- ❑ **Community College Consortium for OER (CCCOER)**
- ❑ **Open Course Library (OCL)**
- ❑ **OpenLearn**

- ❑ **TESS-India**
- ❑ **Bridge to Success**
- ❑ **OpenStax CNX (formerly Connexions)**
- ❑ **School of Open**
- ❑ **BCcampus Open Textbook Project**
- ❑ **MERLOT**
- ❑ **ROER4D**
- ❑ **The Saylor Academy**
- ❑ **Siyavula**
- ❑ **Project Co-PILOT (Community of Practice for Information Literacy Online Teaching)**

Each of the collaborations had a researcher from the Research Hub assigned to work with them. Three or more of the 11 hypotheses were also allocated to each collaboration, with hypotheses A (Performance) and B (Openness) being relevant to all. In addition, one fellow from each collaboration visited the Open University to focus on a specific area of research.

Supplementary to the evidence acquired from these targeted collaborations, the project also incorporated evidence from the OER community and published research, which was added to the evidence map. The team adopted an agile methodology adapted from software development. This was focused around weeklong sprints which targeted particular hypotheses. One such

sprint focused on populating the evidence map from research repositories and through regular review of academic journals.

The overall survey data were gathered across the collaborations, with 7,498 respondents in total, and the frequencies analysis of this data constitutes the main evidence basis for this chapter. The breakdown of respondents from each of the collaborations was as follows:

BCCampus	(<i>n</i> = 85)
Siyavula	(<i>n</i> = 89)
Flipped Learning Network	(<i>n</i> = 118)
CCCOER	(<i>n</i> = 128)
Librarians	(<i>n</i> = 218)
General Survey	(<i>n</i> = 147)
School of Open	(<i>n</i> = 129)
Open Stax	(<i>n</i> = 400)
OU YouTube	(<i>n</i> = 189)
OU iTunes U	(<i>n</i> = 1114)
OpenLearn	(<i>n</i> = 1668)
Saylor	(<i>n</i> = 3213)

A detailed analysis of the evidence is given for the following: each hypothesis (Weller, de los Arcos, Farrow, Pitt, & McAndrew, 2015); open textbook use (Pitt, 2015); K12 teacher adoption (de los Arcos, Farrow, Pitt, Weller, & McAndrew, 2016); informal learners (Farrow, de los Arcos, Pitt, & Weller, 2015). The aim of this contribution is to use this data to identify different types of OER users, which can be classified by different forms of engage-

ment with OERs. This analysis focuses on identifying categories of OER engagement that will inform the intention of making OER use mainstream practice, and is based on the authors' interpretation of the OER data set.

Types of OER Users

Open education in general, and OERs specifically, form a basis from which many other general teaching practices benefit, but often practitioners in those areas are unaware of OERs explicitly. The focus in the OER community thus far has largely been to expand this group of "OER aware" users, but mainstream adoption will see OER usage by new audiences. Analyzing the findings of the OER Research Hub reveals three main categories of OER users: OER active, OER as a facilitator, and OER consumer. The categories include users from different sectors, including educators, formal and informal learners, higher education, and K12. However, some categories may see higher representations of some user types, for instance, the OER active category may have a higher proportion of educators than learners, since it is focused on engagement with the OER movement, but it will not be exclusive to educators.

OER Active

This category of user is aware of OER issues, in that the term itself will have meaning for them, they are engaged with issues around open education, are aware of open licenses,

and are often advocates for OERs. This group has often been the focus of OER funding, conferences, and research, with the aim of growing the size of this audience. An example of this type of user might be the community college teacher who adopts an openly licensed textbook, adapts it, and contributes to open textbooks.

Much of the OER Research Hub work focused on this group, and the findings highlight the positive benefits for this community, for instance, increased confidence from learners, reflection by educators, and cost savings. However, the findings also highlight the difficulties in expanding this group, for instance, in terms of their awareness of OER and the significance of licenses.

With regard to the positive aspects, there is a strong claim concerning the benefits of OERs for both learners and educators, for example, 62.1% of educators and 60.7% of formal learners reported that using OER improved student satisfaction, and 44.1% of educators and 38.9% of formal learners agreed that OER use resulted in better test scores. It must be remembered, however, that these results are self-reported and may not accord with actual performance.

However, the research also revealed that knowing where to find resources is one of the biggest challenges to using OER and that awareness of well-established OER repositories, such as MERLOT, is low compared with free resource sites such as the Khan Academy and TED. There was also a disparity in belief and practice that suggests that

there may be practical barriers in expanding this group of users. For example, only 14% of informal learners (i.e. those learners not currently enrolled in a formal study program) selected OER with an open license allowing adaptation, despite the fact that 84% of all informal learners said they adapted the resources they found to fit their needs (although what “adaptation” means here may vary, as discussed in the next category). Similarly, only 14.8% of educators created resources and published them with a Creative Commons license despite the fact that a majority of educators (70.4%) considered open licensing important and 58.9% were familiar with the Creative Commons logo.

While the OER active group has continued to expand and has established a successful community, it is unrealistic to assume that every educator will become interested and active in the OER movement. It may not be necessary for every educator to engage with OER for it to be considered mainstream, but as with eLearning in general, it would need to impact upon the majority of educational practice. A recent survey of educators in U.S. higher education found that awareness of OER was low, but that awareness was not a requirement for adoption (Allen & Seaman, 2014). This leads to the second category of OER user.

OER as Facilitator

This group may have some awareness of OER, or open licenses, but they have a pragmatic approach toward them. OERs are of sec-

ondary interest to their primary task, which is usually teaching. OER (and openness in general) can be seen as the substratum, which allows some of their practice to flourish, but their awareness of OER issues is low. Their interest is in innovation in their own area, and therefore, OERs are only of interest to the extent that they facilitate innovation or efficiency in this. An example would be a teacher who uses Khan Academy, TED talks, and some OER in their teaching.

One of the collaborations on the OER Research Hub was the FLN. Flipped Learning moves the direct instruction element away from the face-to-face component and into the individual's learning space (Flipped Learning Network, 2014). The face-to-face time is then spent on dynamic, interactive group learning. The claim is that the flipped model reverses the traditional approach as class time is spent doing tasks where students exercise critical thinking and homework is used to support understanding and knowledge acquisition. In practice, this often means giving students videos and other online resources to view at home. OERs are therefore of relevance, in that they can help these educators realize their main aim, which is "flipping" their classroom. They are not absolutely necessary, however, for instance, many educators use YouTube videos without paying attention to the license it has been released under. As well as this, flipping a classroom could be achieved by using licensed materials from content providers, for example, the commercial publisher Pearson offer a course on the "Foundations of Flipped Learning"

[Pearson (n.d.)], and could presumably offer all of the resources to "flip" a classroom for a subscription fee.

However, the OER Research Hub found that adaptation was a key requirement for educators, with 79.4% of all OER users adapting resources to fit their needs. As stated above, though, people's interpretation of adaptation varies. For some users, it means using the resources as inspiration for creating their own material, as this quote illustrates:

What I do is I look at a lot of free resources but I don't usually give them directly to my students because I usually don't like them as much as something I would create, so what I do is I get a lot of ideas.

This is particularly relevant for those in the FLN as they are seeking new ideas to teach their subject. While this is an important use of OER, it arises principally as a result of their online availability rather than openness, and so does not necessarily require OER in order to be realized. However, the freedom to reuse ideas is encouraged by an open license and users feel able to do so without fear of infringing any copyright.

For other users, adaptation is more direct, e.g. editing or re-versioning the original or aggregating elements from different sources to create a more relevant one, as this quote demonstrates:

The problem where I teach now is that we have no money; my

textbooks, my Science textbooks are 20 years old, they're so outdated, they don't relate to kids [...] so I pick and pull from a lot of different places to base my units; they're all based on the Common Core; for me to get my kids to meet the standards that are now being asked of them, I have no choice, I have to have like recent material and stuff they can use that'll help them when they get assessed on the standardized test.

And for others, adaptation may be taking an existing resource and placing it in a different context within their own material. The resource is not adapted, but the manner in which it is used is altered.

What this suggests is that there may be a continuum of adaptation in practice, ranging from adapting ideas for their own material to full re-versioning of content. The degree to which OER are required to realize this adaptation also increases along that continuum. At the “inspiring ideas” end, they are not required for simple reuse in a different context; the open license is useful, but many educators will ignore rights issues if their class is only accessing the material. At the full adaptation end of the continuum, open licensing is required.

It is likely that teachers will not remain static on this continuum; one of the findings of the OER Research Hub was that the more educators used OER, the more willing they were to share. For example, high numbers of both OpenStax College using educators

and Siyavula educator survey respondents report being “more likely” to use other free educational resources/OERs for their teaching as a result of using Siyavula/OpenStax (Siyavula: 90.2%, $n=55$ and OpenStax: 79.5%, $n=58$). Sharing content is made much easier if there are no concerns around licenses.

In the example of Flipped Learning, then, OERs are useful for realizing a different aim, they are a related topic of interest, but not the primary one. However, the open aspect leads to developments that are not possible with resources that are merely digital and online.

Cost savings for students can also be viewed as a goal, which OER can help achieve. Much of the motivation for the open textbook movement relates to the financial burden of buying proprietary textbooks. The potential savings here are one area of OER impact that has seen rigorous, quantitative research. Hilton, Robinson, Wiley, and Ackerman (2014) found an average saving of 90.61 USD per student per course, across a wide range of community and stage college courses. In the OER Research Hub study, 79.6% of formal students (i.e. those enrolled in a program of study at a higher education institute) reported that they saved money by using OER, primarily open textbooks. Cost savings also have other positive impacts on study, for example, in student retention, and immediate access to content, as this quote demonstrates:

I would sure think if institution more fully made use of open

educational resources that we could benefit financially: by retaining more students who otherwise have to drop out because of the high cost of textbooks; by providing higher quality and more diverse and accessible learning and teaching resources which would be a great financial benefit.

However, if cost savings were the only goal, then OERs are not the only answer. Materials could be made free, or subsidized, which are not openly licensed. The intention behind the OER approach is that it has other benefits also, in that educators adapt their material, and it is also an efficient way to achieve the goal of cost savings, because others will adapt the material with the intention of improving its quality, relevance, or currency. As with the FLN, OERs are, in this instance, one means of achieving a related objective.

OER Consumer

This group will use OER among a mix of other media and often not differentiate between them. Awareness of licenses is low and not a priority. OERs are a “nice to have” option but not essential, and users are often largely consuming rather than creating and sharing. An example might be students studying at university who use iTunes U materials to supplement their taught material.

For this type of user, the main features of OERs are their free use, reliability, and quality. One under-reported use of OERs is by formal learners

to sample study in their topic before entering the formal study, with 52.7% of formal learners accessing OER indicated that they were using OER to supplement their formal studies. Similarly, 32.4% of learners stated that their interest in using OER was a chance to try university-level content before signing up for a paid-for course.

Similarly, many learners were using OERs to supplement study while currently in formal education, with 46.9% of all formal learners in our sample stating that OER had a positive impact in helping them complete their course of study. For these users, the OERs need to be freely available, at the appropriate level of study and from a reputable institution. The open license is not a primary concern for this group, although there may be circumstances when they wish to adapt, or share them. This was reflected in the importance learners placed on the factors that influence their selection of OER, the top three of which were: relevance to their particular needs; a good description of learning objectives and outcomes; ease of download. The presence of a Creative Commons license was ranked 14th out of a possible 17 options.

A related use of OER is that for informal learners, it can function as an alternative to formal study. For these learners, the quality and zero cost were important, with our study showing that 89% of learners using OER say that the opportunity to study at no cost influenced their decision to use OER.

These learners are studying for personal interest predominantly: 86.3%

state this as the main reason over improved job opportunities or mandated requirements. For these learners, the quality of the content is of prime interest, and the lack of formal support is not seen as significant for their goals, with only 18.7% stating that not having the support of a tutor/teacher to help them was a barrier to their use of OER.

For this category of OER user, open licensing is at best an additional bonus, over the quality and usefulness of the resource. This is captured in this quote referring to the Siyavula open textbook project in South Africa:

OER per se does not excite learners. Good content does—free or paid, legal or pirated. Siyavula's stuff works because it is GOOD. Being CC makes it legal to download, not fun to use. There are 100's of free/CC Geogebra resources. 98% are useless to me.

Discussion

Three categories of OER use have been identified through the work of the OER Research Hub: OER active; OER as facilitator; OER consumer. In expanding the OER community over the past 12 years, the focus has largely been on growing the first of these groups, that is, making people aware of the benefits of OER use and adaptation.

This has been a successful strategy in establishing a sufficiently large OER community globally such that OER projects can be developed, fund-

ing can be secured, and advocacy can be conducted. All of these actions are required to establish a sustainable community, and represent the necessary foundation for a movement to enter the mainstream.

However, in order for OER to become part of mainstream practice in education, additional strategies are required in order to meet the needs of the other two categories of users identified here.

Wiley (2009) has talked of “Dark Reuse,” that is when reuse is happening in places that cannot be observed, analogous to dark matter, or simply it is not happening at all. Wiley challenges the OER movement about its aims:

If our goal is catalyzing and facilitating significant amounts of reuse and adaptation of materials, we seem to be failing. [...] If our goal is to create fantastically popular websites loaded with free content visited by millions of people each month, who find great value in the content but never adapt or remix it, then we're doing fairly well.

Wiley contrasts creating popular websites and the reuse of content, but by considering these three perspectives of OER engagement, it is possible to see how both elements of Wiley's goals are realizable, as they represent different aims for each category. The main focus of OER initiatives has often been the OER active group. It is this group that creates open resources and advocates the movement. For example, Wild (2012) suggests three levels of engage-

ment for HE staff that progress from piecemeal to strategic to embedded use of OER. The implicit assumption is that one should encourage progression through these levels, that is, the route to success for OER is to increase the population of what we have here labeled the OER active group. Perryman and Seal (2016) expand on this model that incorporates inhibitors and enablers (such as Internet access) to account for uptake in developing nations.

While expanding the OER active group is undoubtedly a requirement for the mainstream adoption of OERs, it may not be the only approach. Another strategy may focus on increasing penetration of OER into the other categories of users identified here. As awareness of OER repositories was very low among these users, a way of improving uptake for these groups is to increase the visibility, search engine optimization, and convenience of the resources themselves, without presuming a specific knowledge of open education. This might be realized through creating a trusted brand to compete with resources such as TED. If this was desirable then the funding and ownership of such an open brand would then be a focus for development.

Similarly, a strategic aim to engage with the second two groups would influence both the formats of OER and the content. For instance, the popularity of content varied across users' groups, with educators favoring science and maths, formal learners preferring science, psychology and philosophy, and computer science, economics, and

business preferred by informal learners. Video was the preferred format across all groups, but if the OER community were to target the OER consumer directly, then shorter content that is more viral in nature may be preferable. The community would then be focusing on promoting the development of these types of OER.

These categories of OER users are not exclusive, nor does an individual remain fixed within a category. Once users have encountered OER they are keen to access more of it, with 84.5% of informal learners stating that they are more likely to take another open course or study a free OER. Educators in particular often become advocates, with 95% saying they share OERs. This quote from a K12 teacher was typical of the increase in sharing practice brought about by exposure to OERs:

Free online resources have virtually opened up my world for sharing resources. Our district will never be able to pay, nor will I, so sharing was just a chance thing before now. Now, it is a daily occurrence most times.

There may be some progression, therefore, from either OER consumer or OER as facilitator into the OER active category. However, it is not necessary for this progression and increased OER awareness to occur for OERs to achieve mainstream adoption. Within one project or institution, it is possible to witness all three types of user in operation. For example, Tidewater Community College embarked on the

Z-degree program (to make zero cost textbooks available to students) with two aims (DeMarte & Williams, 2015):

- to improve student success through increased access and affordability,
- to improve teaching efficiency and effectiveness through the ability to focus, analyze, augment, and evolve course materials directly aligned to course learning outcomes.

OER was seen as a facilitator of these aims, but the project required its adopters to be OER aware. As the project expands to more courses in the college, it may be that the instructors are more interested in OER as a facilitator that allows revised course design and improved retention.

Although the OER Research Hub survey represents one of the most comprehensive studies of OER usage, it has its limitations; further investigation is needed in order to validate these categories and to assess some of the finer detail within each. The first of these limitations is geographical coverage. There were 180 different countries in the respondents but a concentration in the United States (35.8%) and United Kingdom (21%). In considering the strategies to realize mainstream adoption of OER, it is likely that the needs of these three categories of users will differ by region, so more focused studies in specific areas are needed.

Similarly, the needs of users across different demographic groups within these categories are likely to

vary. The respondents in the OER Research Hub surveys tended to be well qualified with a majority holding a postgraduate (34.4%) or undergraduate degree (27.5%), and a very small percentage declaring that they have no formal qualification (4.3%).

Lastly, these surveys looked at users who were already accessing OERs through one route, even if they were unaware of the term “OER.” In order to gain mainstream adoption, it will be necessary to study how other, casual users can gain access to OERs.

Notwithstanding these limitations, the Research Hub survey represents the best cross-section of OER users currently available and as such, it provides a useful means of considering the next phase of OER strategy. If the intention to become part of mainstream practice is to be realized then an expansion of usage beyond the current OER active group is required. As well as attempting to grow the community that constitutes this OER active group, different approaches will be required to meet the needs of the OER as facilitator and OER consumer groups.

Conclusion

The OER movement has seen steady growth and development since its inception, and elements are now being accepted into the mainstream of educational practice. In order to achieve widespread adoption, it is likely that new strategies will be required by the OER community, whether researchers, funders, practitioners,

or policymakers. In order to inform this work, it will be necessary to develop a better understanding of how different communities use OERs and the problems OER solves for them.

The work of the OER Research Hub provides a basis for this analysis as it provides a large data set of attitudes and perceptions of OER users. The three categories outlined in this paper of OER active, OER as facilitator, and

OER consumer represent an initial, but not exhaustive attempt, to rationalize these different forms of OER engagements. This analysis highlights that different strategies will be required to suit the expectations of these users, and thus a coordinated, directed vision may be necessary. This will present a challenge for a loose, open community but can be realized through open discussion and targeted funding and projects.

Authors

Martin Weller is the Professor of Educational Technology at the Open University, UK. He chaired the OU's first eLearning course in 1999 with 15,000 students, and has been the Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) Director at the OU. He was part of the team that initiated the OpenLearn project and is currently Director of the OER Research Hub project. He is the author of two books: *The Digital Scholar* and *The Battle for Open*. He blogs at edtechie.net

Beatriz de los Arcos is the Research Associate at the Institute of Educational Technology (IET) at The Open University, UK (OUUK). Prior to her work with OER Hub, she worked on the production and delivery of online distance language learning courses at the Department of Languages at OUUK. She collaborated on the development, implementation, and evaluation of the JISC-funded LORO repository (<http://loro.open.ac.uk>), which provides open education resource for language teaching and learning, and facilitated OT12 MOOC in Open Translation tools and practices, the first ever MOOC produced at The Open University (<http://www.ot12.org>). With OER Hub, she led the project's collaborations and research in the K12 (primary and secondary education) sector, in addition to overseeing data analysis.

Rob Farrow is the Research Fellow in the Institute of Education Technology (IET) at The Open University, UK. He is a philosopher, interdisciplinary researcher, and educational technologist who has worked on many research projects including the European-Commission-funded Mobile Technologies in Lifelong Learning (MO-TILL) and European Unified Framework for Accessible Lifelong Learning (EU-4ALL) projects. In the Open Learning Network (OLnet) project, he was responsible for curating and disseminating evidence about OER. In the OER Research Hub project, he worked with a range of key stakeholders to research the nonformal and institutional use of OER.

Rebecca Pitt is the Research Associate at the Institute of Educational Technology (IET) at The Open University, UK. Beck worked as project and research support on the Gates-funded Bridge to Success project, which collaborated with community colleges in the Maryland area to remix the existing OU whole course OER for use as bridging content for students beginning their college studies. Beck was responsible for a range of collaborative activity during the OER Research Hub Phase I including research with open textbook providers OpenStax CNX, Siyavula and the BC Campus Open Textbook project. She also led the development and delivery of the OER Research Hub's P2PU course Open Research, which was awarded a RCUK/Open University Engaging Research award in February 2015.

Patrick McAndrew is the Professor of Open Education and Director of the Institute of Educational Technology (IET) in The Open University, UK. IET is a strategic academic unit carrying out research, supporting the University, and offering postgraduate qualifications in online and distance education. In his own research, Patrick has taken a leading part in the development of approaches to open and free learning. Recent projects in this area include OpenLearn, OLnet, Bridge to Success, and the OER Research Hub. He has had an active role in over 40 funded-projects across technology-enhanced learning.

References

- Allen, N. (2016). U.S. labor department adopts open licensing policy. Retrieved from <http://sparcopen.org/news/2016/dol-open-licensing-policy>.
- Allen, I. E., & Seaman J. (2014). *Opening the curriculum: Open educational resources in U.S. higher education, 2014*. Babson Survey Research Group. Retrieved from <http://www.onlinelearningsurvey.com/oer.html>.
- Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education. (AACE). Retrieved from <http://www.editlib.org/p/151664>.
- Creative Commons. (2015). State of the commons report. Retrieved from <https://stateof.creativecommons.org/2015>.
- de los Arcos, B., Farrow, R., Pitt, R., Weller, M., & McAndrew, P. (2016). Personalising learning through adaptation: Evidence from a global survey of K-12 teachers' perceptions of their use of open educational resources. *Journal of Online Learning Research*, 2(1), 23–40.
- DeMarte, D., & Williams, L. (2015). The “Z-Degree”: Removing textbook costs as a barrier to student success through an OER-based curriculum. Retrieved from <http://www.scribd.com/doc/256908260/Z-Degree-Final-Report>.

- Farrow, R., de los Arcos, B., Pitt, R., & Weller, M. (2015). Who are the open learners? A comparative study profiling non-formal users of open educational resources. *European Journal of Open, Distance and E-Learning*, 18(2). Retrieved from <http://oro.open.ac.uk/4496>.
- Flipped Learning Network. (2014). Definition of flipped learning. Retrieved from <http://fln.schoolwires.net/site/Default.aspx?PageID=92>.
- Government Accounts Office. (2005). College textbooks: Enhanced offerings appear to drive recent price increases. Retrieved from <http://www.gao.gov/assets/250/247332.pdf>.
- Green, C. (2013). The impact of open textbooks at OpenStax college. Retrieved from <https://creativecommons.org/2013/07/08/the-impact-of-open-textbooks-at-openstax-college/>.
- Hilton III, J., Robinson, T., Wiley, D., & Ackerman, J. (2014). Cost-savings Achieved in two semesters through the adoption of open educational resources. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 15(2). Retrieved from <http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/1700/2833>.
- MIT OCW. (2015). About MIT Open-CourseWare. Retrieved from <http://ocw.mit.edu/about>.
- OER Conference. (2015). 14–14 April 2015. Cardiff, UK. Retrieved from <https://oer15.oerconf.org>.
- Open Education Consortium. (2015). Open education consortium members. Retrieved from <http://www.oeconsortium.org/members>.
- OpenStax College. (2014). Our textbooks have saved students \$30 million. Retrieved from <https://www.openstaxcollege.org/news/our-textbooks-have-saved-students-30-million>.
- Pearson. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.pearsonschool.com/index.cfm?locator=PS2244>.
- Perryman, L.-A., Law, P., & Law, A. (2013). Developing sustainable business models for institutions' provision of open educational resources: Learning from OpenLearn users' motivations and experiences. *Proceedings: The Open and Flexible Higher Education Conference 2013*, Paris. Retrieved from http://www.eadtueu/images/stories/Docs/Conference_2013/eadtueu_annual_conference_2013-proceedings.pdf.
- Perryman, L.-A., & Seal, T. (2016). Open educational practices and attitudes to openness across India: Reporting the findings of the open education research hub pan-India survey. *Journal of Interactive Media in Education*, 1(15), 1–17. Retrieved from http://oro.open.ac.uk/46370/1/JIME_Pan-India.pdf. Retrieved from <http://doi.org/10.5334/jime.416>.
- Pitt, R. (2015). Mainstreaming open textbooks: Educator perspectives on the impact of OpenStax college open

- textbooks. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning (IRRODL)*, 16(4), 133–155. Retrieved from <http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/2381>.
- SPARC. (2015). Analysis of funder open access policies around the world. Retrieved from <http://sparceurope.org/analysis-of-funder-open-access-policies-around-the-world>.
- 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. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.5944/openpraxis.7.4.227>.
- Wild, J. (2012). OER engagement study: Promoting OER reuse among academics: *SCORE Research Report*, uuid:eca4f-8cd-edf5-4b38-a9b0-4dd2d4e59750. Retrieved from <https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/>.
- Wiley, D. (2009). Dark matter, dark reuse, and the irrational zeal of a believer. Retrieved from <http://opencontent.org/blog/archives/905>.
- Wiley, D. (2011). The \$5 textbook. Retrieved from <http://www.slideshare.net/opencontent/the-5-textbook>.
- William and Flora Hewlett Foundation. (n.d.). Open educational resources. Retrieved from <http://www.hewlett.org/programs/education/open-educational-resources>.
- William and Flora Hewlett Foundation. (2013). White paper: Open educational resources—breaking the lockbox on education. Retrieved from <http://www.hewlett.org/library/hewlett-foundation-publication/white-paper-open-educational-resources>.