

Open Peer Review

Bourdages, L. (2022, October). [Review of the article, Do OER textbooks have value beyond cost savings? An analysis of student attitudes and faculty teaching strategies in an American university, by Y. Wu]. Journal of Open Educational Resources in Higher Education, 1(1), 105-108.
doi:10.13001/joerhe.v1i1.7201

Reviewer: Lauren Bourdages

Recommendation: Accept Submission

Scope, Objectives, Content

Is the article in scope for Journal of Open Educational Resources in Higher Education? Does the topic discuss an element related to open education, open data, open access, or other open topics? Is the topic an important one, or is it trivial or of low priority?

The topic discussed in this paper explores the effectiveness of open educational resources a key element in the open education umbrella. This topic is essential because it looks at OERs beyond just cost savings which is the most talked about element but not the most important. This is a meaningful conversation to have.

Organization

Does the article proceed logically? As applicable, does the article adhere to a recommended structure and the section guideline?

The article follows a logical structure that I am used to seeing in an academic journal. The sections flow in the expected order and are all present.

Methodology, Approach, Conclusions

The methodology for data gathering and analysis should be appropriate for the problem addressed. Inferences from data should be sound--the author should not reach unsupported conclusions. Not all papers will use a scientific research methodology, but all should employ sound reasoning and an adequate balance between description and critical analysis. Consider: Is the article factually accurate? Is it clear the

author knows, or has investigated, previous work on the subject of the article? Has the author failed to reference recent or seminal work on the subject?

Applying methods from studies on textbook use is a novel approach to studying the effectiveness of OERs, I haven't seen this brought up very often and this is the first time I can remember seeing a full research study done in this manner. It's clear that the author understands the subject and is aware of previous work done in both OERs and student textbook use in general. The literature review was very thorough. I do wonder why the study was limited to only students in face-to-face courses, especially given the growth in online learning over the last few years. There are often radically different instructional design strategies used in online learning vs. in-class learning that lead to different types of textbook usage. The exclusion of this demographic without any explanation about limitations feels like a gap in the research. The conclusions logically flow from the literature review and study analysis.

Writing Style, References

Please indicate whether there are problems with expression or flow, but do not comment about grammar or basic edits. Do NOT take the time to do copy editing - that will be handled later in the process. However, general comments pointing out problems with style or format are useful.

In terms of flow, I found the early part of the analysis section hard to read because of the way the test results were incorporated, they break up the flow in a way that makes it hard to understand the analyses being made.

Application:

Does the article contribute knowledge or practical examples that will inform/improve others' practice or education?

The article contributes a new understanding of an ongoing problem and does a good job of highlighting other areas that need to be explored and makes suggestions for how other researchers could explore them.

What are the stronger points/qualities of the article?

The conclusions drawn by this study are a highlight as is the construction of the study itself. The literature review is very strong and has a good breadth and depth.

What are the weaker points/qualities of the article? How could they be strengthened?

In the analysis section, the author mentions several types of test by name, specifically the Chi-Square, Cramér's V and Bonferroni tests, it would be beneficial to the reader if these tests were explained somewhere in the body of the article such as in side boxes or through hyperlinks. It's better for the reader if the author doesn't assume that they have prior knowledge of the tests they are using.

Peer Review Ranking: Scope

Does the topic discuss an element related to open education, open data, open access, or other open topics?

Highly Relevant

Peer Review Ranking: Clarity

Clarity of expression and flow? Does the article proceed logically?

Very Clear

Peer Review Ranking: Contribution

Contribution to Higher Education research and/or practice

Contributes

Peer Review Ranking: Research Assessment

If this is a research paper, is the methodology appropriate?

Appropriate

Peer Review Ranking: Research Assessment

If this is a research paper, is the methodology appropriate? Does the article contribute knowledge or practical examples that will inform/improve others' practice or education?

Sound

Overall Evaluation

2- Accept
