Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

Openness re-examined: teachers' practices with open educational resources in online language teaching

Journal Item

How to cite:

Pulker, Hélène and Kukulska-Hulme, Agnes (2020). Openness re-examined: teachers' practices with open educational resources in online language teaching. *Distance Education*, 41(2) pp. 216–229.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 2020 Open and Distance Learning Association of Australia, Inc

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Version: Accepted Manuscript

Link(s) to article on publisher's website:

<http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1080/01587919.2020.1757412>

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk

Openness re-examined: Teachers' practices with open educational resources in online language teaching

Hélène Pulker

School of Languages and Applied Linguistics, the Open University, Milton Keynes, UK

helene.pulker@open.ac.uk

Agnes Kukulska-Hulme

Institute of Educational Technology, the Open University, Milton Keynes, UK

Openness re-examined: Teachers' practices with open educational resources in online language teaching

Abstract

Open educational practices (OEP) have a long history in the field of distance education, but open educational practices as a research field is relatively new. One aspect that has received limited attention is the impact of the use of open educational resources (OER) on the development of open educational practices (OEP). This paper, based on a doctoral study, discusses the experience of teaching with OER and the impact that OER reuse can have on open educational practices in the context of online language teaching. The study examined the activities that teachers engage with when reusing and adapting OER with a view to providing evidence of reuse and understanding whether the activities have an effect on online and open teaching practices. A qualitative study following a constructivist grounded theory methodology was undertaken with 17 part-time online language teachers from the Open University (UK), via individual semi-structured online interviews. The paper presents the five-step model of reuse that emerged from the data analysis and discusses the impact of OER reuse on open educational practices. The authors suggest that OER reuse has a positive impact on open educational practices even though the practices might not be 'open' as defined up until now. This study is significant because it focuses on 'open processes' (Knox, 2013) and pedagogical practices with OER. A graphic representation of the findings highlights the process that teachers engage with while using and adapting OER. It brings new understanding about teachers' experiences of reuse showing that the principal motivation for using and adapting OER is to enhance students' learning experience over engaging with digital OEP.

Keywords: OER, OEP, distance education, language teaching, closed spaces

Introduction

Open educational practices have a long history in the field of distance education, but open educational practices as a research field is relatively new (Weller, Jordan, De Vries and Rolfe, 2018). According to an exploratory literature review (Koseoglu and Bozkurt, 2018), OEP research can be categorised into two different strands: research on OEP in the context of OER creation, use and adoption, and research on OEP in relation to an open ecosystem that includes, for example, open learning, open teaching, open scholarship, open pedagogy, open assessment, open data and open source. Overall, research indicates that there is a paucity of literature on processes related to OER reuse and OEP (Knox, 2013). An aspect that has received limited attention is the impact of OER reuse on teaching practices. Open education advocates with a critical perspective on openness call for contextualised studies that examine the values and potential of an OEP approach to facilitate open sharing of teaching practices that empower educators to benefit from the best ideas of their colleagues (Cape Town Open Education Declaration, 2007).

This paper, based on a doctoral study, addresses OEP in the context of OER reuse for online and distance language teaching in higher education. The research aimed to examine the activities language teachers engage in when they reuse and adapt OER, and how OER reuse and adaptation impact on teaching practices.

Open educational practices

Open educational practices (OEP) have emerged as a key area of development within open education as a move of the focus of the OER movement from resources to

practices. OEP is a multi-faceted concept, often defined as: *‘practices which support the (re)use and production of OER through institutional policies, promote innovative pedagogical models, and respect and empower learners as co-producers on their lifelong learning path’* (Ehlers, 2011, p. 4). Whereas OER are focusing on content and resources, OEP represents the practice in which an educational method is employed to create a better educational environment in which OER are used or created as learning resources. In other words, ‘OEP are the use of OER with the aim to improve quality of educational processes and innovate educational environments’ (Conole and Ehlers, 2010).

Many studies have focused on the creation, use and adoption of OER (Browne, et al., 2010; Coughlan, et al., 2013; Cox and Trotter, 2017; Hodginson-Williams, 2010; Kozinska, et al., 2010; Schuwer and Janssen, 2018; Wild, 2012; Wills and Pegler, 2016) as well as the sustainability of the movement (Downes, 2007; deLangen, 2018). Research has shown that despite their promise to transform education, OER has not fulfilled expectations (Knox, 2013; Weller, 2014). Ehlers (2011) explains that the lack of use of OER in higher and adult education was due to the fact that the focus in OER was mainly on building more access to digital content rather than how OER supported educational practices, and how OER promoted quality and innovation in teaching and learning. The work from the OPAL¹ initiative was a significant stepping stone in terms of shift from OER to OEP. Ehlers (2011) proposed a three-dimension framework to facilitate the shift from OER usage to OEP. The shift is characterised by a change in activities leading to new learning models to encourage the uptake of OEP. Ehlers (2011)

¹ The Open Education Quality (OPAL) was initiated at the University of Leicester to focus on the provision of innovative OEP and the promotion of quality, innovation and transparency in higher and adult education.

recommends that institutions can use the framework to analyse and facilitate OEP in relation to different target groups (policy makers, educators, learners) to help them to address important issues within their contexts to move OEP to a higher level of maturity.

Wiley (2014) developed the 5R framework (retain, reuse, revise, remix, redistribute) which provides educators with free content and legal permissions to engage in continuous and incremental adaptation and new creations, taking ownership of their materials in a manner not previously possible (Wiley and Green, 2012). By introducing the term ‘OER-enabled pedagogy’, Wiley (2018) encourages practitioners and researchers to talk about how the 5R activities facilitate new kinds of teaching and learning in general. The OER-enabled pedagogy recognises that knowledge consumption and knowledge creation are not separate but parallel processes, as knowledge is co-constructed, contextualised, cumulative and iterative. In this sense, open licenses allow for the remixing and revision of OER, and also lead to a particular way of thinking about teaching and learning. Remixing and reversioning of resources enable teachers to make the shift from an instructional mindset, that of ‘how am I going to teach this particular point?’ to ‘how do I create or modify instructional resources to serve my pedagogical goals?’ (DeRosa and Jhangiani, 2017). This view of openness, whereby teachers and learners are free to use, adapt, and re-appropriate licensed materials created by others with a view to creating new resources to suit local needs may be limited to OER use and adaptation. Nonetheless, remixing and repurposing of resources aims to improve quality of educational provision and therefore it is similar to Ehler’s concern to improve the learning process. Besides, the permission to ‘redistribute’ is an incentive to encourage OER users to share new and repurposed resources, and in that sense represents a shift from OER to OEP.

However, such a view on OEP has been widely challenged and a number of scholars have argued that OEP is multidimensional and goes beyond the simple use of OER (Ehlers, 2011; Havemann, 2016; Cronin, 2018; Bozkurt et al., 2019; Cronin and McLaren, 2018; Koseoglu and Bozkurt, 2018; Naidu, 2016). Ehlers (2011) points out that using a repository of OER in a traditional teaching and learning setting is not OEP. Instead, he explains that if OER are used to develop new resources or create resources which are more learner-centred, in other words if teachers are moving from content-centred teaching to a more ‘human resource-based teaching’, then OER might improve the learning process, and this would, in his view, qualify as open educational practices. Cronin (2018) stresses that OEP is not a holistic approach but that the use of OEP is ‘complex, personal, contextual and continually negotiated’ (p. 158). Researchers who see OEP as part of a broader open ecosystem have described and theorised OEP using a variety of other concepts. Some define OEP as the set of practices that accompany the adoption of open pedagogy where teachers and learners can interact more easily, share their work, and collaborate in connected learning environments (Hegarty, 2015; DeRosa and Jhangiani, 2017). Open pedagogy is considered to be a practice that facilitates human connections through technologies to help learners engage more fully with knowledge consumption and creation. Others, as reported in Bozkurt and Koseoglu (2018), focus their research in the broader context of networked, social and collaborative learning where practitioners use participatory technologies, and they refer to digital open pedagogical practices (Cronin, 2018).

Context

The study reported in this paper took place at The Open University, UK. The Open University (OU) is a distance learning university that has always adopted open and distance education as a teaching and learning model.

In 2009, the Department of Languages developed LORO (Languages Open Resources Online) a repository of online resources for synchronous online teaching to enable language teachers to have access to all teaching resources across levels and languages. The creation of a repository to host ready-made resources accessible from one central place aimed to support training and professional development in online teaching skills through fostering collaborative learning and the open sharing of best practices in creating and reusing OER for language teaching.

LORO resources were designed to address specific learning outcomes for language learning; they were licensed under the Creative Commons, and they could be accessed, adapted, reused, or redistributed by all users. Furthermore, LORO resources were designed on the principles of a communicative approach, an established collaborative teaching methodology for second language teaching to foster speaking skills development, advocated by many in the computer-assisted language learning research community (for example, Kern, 2006). Although primarily created for OU language teachers, the resources in LORO were made freely accessible worldwide, and contributions from all users were encouraged. The repository was therefore partly populated with peer-reviewed resources, created by the Department of Languages' course developers, and partly with resources created by its users. This principle aligns with the dual approach recommended by Downes (2007) that provides a measure of reputational credibility, marking a separation between a 'branding' approach and an approach exclusively focused on community sharing, where the resources can be regarded as useful without having to be exemplary.

Training in the use of the repository was embedded in in-house training programmes and the introduction of OER reuse was integrated into well-established language teacher training methods. OER creators and users were identified as champions to support newer colleagues and teachers with less confidence in the online tools. In its initial stage, LORO fostered the development of a community of online language teachers enabling online novice teachers to learn from more expert teachers through downloading and using resources from peers.

Methodology

The study aimed to investigate activities in which language teachers engage during reuse and adaptation of OER and to establish whether these activities have an impact on teaching practices and on open educational practices. To address these aims, an inductive qualitative study was conducted following Charmaz's (2014) constructivist grounded theory methods. Data were collected by means of an online questionnaire sent to the 282 part-time language teachers employed in the Department of Languages at the OU at the time, and 17 individual semi-structured online interviews.

The questionnaire comprised five sections, and its aims were threefold:

- (1) To collect data about the interview participants (demographics, background, teaching experience at the OU, language(s) and level(s) taught, proportion of face-to-face and online teaching, conference tools used at the OU.
- (2) To gather data about interview participants' attitudes towards reuse of materials created by others. There was a filter question to identify teachers who never reuse OER. It was important to identify participants who were secondary users of resources. Responses to questions on reuse of materials created by others, provided in the online questionnaire, guided the interview questions for each participant.

(3) To identify volunteers for interviews. The 67 respondents to the questionnaire were able to identify themselves to participate in an interview in the last survey question. 24 questionnaire respondents volunteered, of which the 17 who had indicated an active use of LORO resources were chosen.

The 17 interview participants possessed a range of experiences and came from diverse backgrounds. There was a mix of male and female teachers, aged from late-twenties to mid-sixties. Some were English native speakers and some were natives (and originated) from the countries where the language they taught is spoken. They taught French, German, Spanish, Italian, Chinese, Exploring Languages and Cultures and English for Business or Academic Purposes across all undergraduate levels from beginners to level 3 (A1 to C1 levels of the Common European Framework of Reference for the language modules) online via an audio-video conferencing tool to deliver the synchronous online tutorials. At the time of the research, OU language teachers used the OULive audio-video conferencing system to prepare and deliver synchronous online tutorials. The interviews were conducted in an OULive online room, identical to the one in which teachers prepared and conducted their online tutorials.

The interview questions were based on Charmaz's (2014) guidelines and organised in three phases: (1) General conversation on the transition to online teaching and the introduction of the LORO repository; (2) Examples of adapted resources and reflections on OER reuse and teaching methodologies; and (3) Wrap-up and discussion about attitudes towards reuse of OER. Interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim.

Data were analysed following a 3-phase coding: initial coding, focused coding and categorisation, and the constant comparative method (Glaser, 2005). Consistent

with a constructivist grounded theory approach, conceptual categories for the analysis of data were allowed to emerge, rather than initially driven by a theoretical framework. Each interview transcript was initially coded with words reflecting actions ('saving time', 'searching for ideas', etc.). The initial codes were provisional, descriptive, grounded in and close to the data. The codes that became increasingly predominant were grouped into focused codes, using *a priori* ideas from practice and thinking about the data analytically, and developing the concepts that led to the five final categories.

In grounded theory, reliability and validity of emerging categories is verified through the constant comparative method (Glaser, 2005) which constantly cross-verifies information as the iterative process of data analysis goes back and forth from data to data. For this study, data to data cross verification was carried out in several ways. First, the participants responses were analysed in relation to the examples of adapted resources that they displayed and explained during the interviews. Second, the data set was analysed against respondents' profile and the type of users they belong to (see findings). Finally, semantics and lexis used were analysed throughout interview transcripts and cross verified with codes. The *in-vivo* codes used by respondents were identified and participants' profiles used to examine the different ways participants talked about OER reuse to compare participants' use of language to the actions they described through their examples of adapted resources. 'Grounded theorising' involves an iterative process in which ideas are used to make sense of data, and data are used to change our ideas. The researcher must be prepared to go beyond the data to develop ideas that will clarify them. The central injunction of grounded theory is that there should be constant interplay between data and ideas throughout the research process. Ideas also emerge from the researcher's experience in the field, and from his or her preliminary analytical reflections on the data.

However reliable and valid these findings might be, they are not generalisable because they are context-specific and confined to the academic discipline of language learning. An investigation into the reuse of OER in other disciplines and other educational settings might make it possible to verify whether the findings of this study are limited to language teachers in an institution of higher education in distance and online learning, or whether the insights gained through this study can be generalised to a wider spectrum of teachers. The findings of our study could be tested through a larger-scale survey using the same instruments for data collection with research participants from various disciplines and various institutions in the UK and internationally where the reuse of OER is common practice.

Findings

The five-step model of reuse

The findings that emerged from the analysis are illustrated in Figure 1. Three types of users were identified: OER passive users, OER active adopters and OER innovative re-designers. All three types of users engage in a five-step process that includes: finding inspiration from colleagues' resources, re-appropriating those resources, reflecting on practices, learning and developing as an online and distance language teacher, and sharing the newly created resources in closed spaces. All five steps that teachers engage with during the reuse process aim to satisfy and improve students' needs and learning experience. The way teachers engage in the process depends on what type of users they are. Each type of user displays different attitudes towards the technology, reuse and adaptation of resources and sharing. They have different practices and beliefs with regard to online teaching and their students' needs.

Figure 1 – The five-step model of reuse

Finding inspiration

Generally, all users browsed to find new ideas or complement their existing materials, and to find out how and what their peers teach. This finding is consistent with that of Weller et al. (2015) who also found that teachers use OER to draw inspiration.

However, motivations for looking at how colleagues teach and searching for new ideas vary according to user type. Some of the passive users, long term OU teachers, who had indicated that they were reluctant to make the transfer from face-to-face to online teaching expressed, if not a negative, at least a more reserved attitude towards creating and using OER.

Conversely, the OER active adopters tended to be ‘grateful’ for the ready-made resources, while the OER innovative re-designers used other people’s materials primarily to save time and to find new inspiring ideas to recreate their own materials. Three active adopters sought reassurance that their materials ‘followed the curriculum’. They were concerned to offer a ‘standardised’ experience to their students, which may be more of a concern in this particular OU context, where a pool of tutors teach groups of learners studying the same course across many locations.

Re-appropriating

All participants re-appropriated materials as they used and adapted them. However, this study shows that the degree to which resources are re-appropriated depends on the type of user and the level of confidence in digital skills. OER passive users said that adapting resources took time, particularly if images needed replacing. OER passive users' resources appear more traditional, structured and linear. Their resources contain more text and are less visual, and not particularly interactive.

OER active adopters and innovative re-designers preferred to re-appropriate the materials to make them more interactive and more student-centred, which often required technical adaptations. OER innovative re-designers liked to use resources from 'trusted' colleagues, as they found that a ready-made activity that could easily be adapted and used was time-saving. The examples of re-appropriated resources showed that the more IT-savvy OER users were, the more they found that adapting was time-saving.

Regardless of the types of adaptation, all users made changes to gain ownership of the resources. Tomlinson (2011) shows that teachers adapt materials to make them their own. It seems therefore that practices in material adaptation, whether from textbooks or digital materials, do not differ. This finding could potentially challenge the idea that OER reuse would save resources and costs in higher education (Downes, 2007). If teachers use OER for inspiration only, and not in their original form, reuse does not fulfill the expectation that it will save educational institutions time and resources, and therefore costs.

OER passive users do not use or adapt extensively, while OER active adopters frequently use and adapt OER. Active adopters might edit slides, add instructions or

change activities. OER innovative re-designers take ideas from resources and recreate new ones, keeping the same model, making technical adjustments.

Reflecting

The examples of adapted and reworked resources demonstrate that all teachers interviewed in this study, regardless of their user type, engage in self-reflection about their materials, their teaching approaches online and more specifically their students' needs. The reflection happens at two different points in the reuse process, along the lines of Schön's (1983) reflection 'in' and 'on' action. First, the teachers reflect during the browsing and choosing phase when they reflect on previous tutorials and previous materials used, thinking through the activities that worked, and the ones that did not work. During this material evaluation phase, teachers often talk about 'understanding the resource' or looking for 'something that makes sense'. In most cases, regardless of their user type, the teachers reflect on the resources in relation to their own beliefs about teaching languages online.

Teachers also think about the need to present their materials clearly and effectively for oral communication online. For example, there were many examples of adapted resources showing added coloured background to increase legibility for students with learning difficulties, such as dyslexia.

Through providing examples of reuse, the teachers took the opportunity to reflect on their teaching practices and beliefs. The comments and reflections they provided while explaining their changes arose naturally without any prompt. The activities of selection and re-appropriation of materials generated natural self-reflection. This study indicates therefore that when teachers are given time and opportunities to talk about practices, they enjoy reflecting on pedagogy and online teaching.

Learning and developing

All participants declared that they were learning through reuse and adaptation. They often mentioned that they were learning from experience by trying resources and getting feedback from students; they also mention learning from colleagues and doing ‘peer observation’ through browsing the repository.

In most cases, examples of adapted resources show that using and adapting OER led to improved materials: most respondents mentioned that, as a result of adapting colleagues’ materials, they have made their own more student-centred, more interactive, more visually attractive, clearer, and overall more suitable for online teaching. So, there seems to be an overall feeling from participants that using colleagues’ materials influences material design and teaching techniques.

As teachers described the changes they had made to the resources, they discussed their teaching beliefs at the same time and articulated effectively their reasons for the modifications. The respondents had precise ideas about what they wanted to achieve during their tutorials, and the changes were clearly linked to their teaching objectives and students’ learning outcomes. It seems that the changes were led by their beliefs and ideas about language teaching. Teachers who preferred static resources, for example, tended to want to do grammar lessons, as they believed it was an important aspect of the language learning. They articulated clearly the reasons for the screens they used. Similarly, teachers who used interactive resources seemed to expect students to be active, revise the vocabulary and come up with the grammar rules by themselves. Teachers who practised such activities worked with students in the context of a task, which is symptomatic of teachers who see themselves as facilitators of learning, rather

than teachers in the traditional sense. Similarly, participants who provided scaffoldings and added prompts to original resources aimed to facilitate oral production.

Sharing in closed spaces

This research shows that teachers retain the new resources they produce for reuse with students and sharing with close colleagues. Teachers do not ‘redistribute’ their newly created resources in public spaces, corroborating the findings of previous work, such as Beaven (2014), Comas-Quinn et al. (2013), and Browne et al., (2010). Participants gave several reasons as to why they did not ‘redistribute’. First, there was a lack of confidence in IT skills, particularly among OER passive users, and a general feeling of insecurity towards teachers’ own materials, and the fear of putting them in a public space for scrutiny and evaluation. Secondly, teachers felt that new content was often created with one purpose in mind: to suit a specific group of students. Teachers then believed that the tailored-made created content was of no use or value to others. This was also found by Beaven (2014). Thirdly, some teachers retained their content because they generally opposed the production model currently practised at the OU: OER are created by a hybrid model consisting of a centralised team of course developers (paid) and a community of users/contributors, who create and share content through good will, for free. Finally, teachers did not ‘redistribute’ in repositories because it required too much work, particularly understanding CC licences, and therefore time, to present a resource for online publication.

Discussion

The five-step model of reuse that emerged from the study reinforces some of the existing knowledge of OER reuse: teachers find inspiration in browsing through colleagues’ resources, they re-appropriate resources to make them their own and to suit

their teaching styles and beliefs, they reflect on their teaching choices and approaches and they learn by trial and error while adapting resources from colleagues and sharing with students. The findings confirm that teachers retain the new resources they produce for reuse with students and sharing with close colleagues. This is what Wills and Pegler (2016) conceptualised as ‘the zones of proximity’, whereby secondary users are most likely to use materials from people they know and share with them. This study corroborates the findings of previous work, such as Beaven (2014), Comas-Quinn et al. (2013), Browne et al., (2010). At the same time, the research raises some challenging questions with regard to the development of digital OEP.

Do language teaching practices change as a result of OER reuse ?

As teachers look for resources that match their teaching beliefs, it seems that OER users do not alter their teaching approaches drastically as a result of using other people’s materials. Teachers look at the resources and form their own interpretations according to what they believe can ‘work’. Examples of reworked resources showed that teachers tend to redesign a brand new resource based on a resource that would allow them to use their own teaching approaches. The transformation of resources does not in itself guarantee transformation in teaching practices. The resource in itself is not important; rather, what is important is: what use teachers actually make of them (Mishra, 2017).

Even though there is no clear indication that teachers have changed their methods of teaching languages online as such, there is ample evidence in adapted resources that shows that OER users have become more inclusive, more diverse and more student-centred in their teaching. Overall, examples of adapted resources show that teachers have made adaptations that indicate they are open to:

- students with learning disabilities (change of resource's background colour to support students with dyslexia, for example)
- students' various learning aptitudes (introduction of scaffoldings in activities to enable weaker students to participate orally)
- students' different cultural backgrounds (adaptation of resources to be mindful of different cultures)
- the wide range of students' age (adaptation to ensure images/activities were approachable by all regardless of age)
- students' feedback and content (adaption including student-generated content and students' reactions to an activity or an image)
- new ways of teaching (adaptation showing that the teacher is becoming more of a facilitator, giving more space to students' creation of knowledge)

What counts as open?

Overall, this study strengthens the idea developed by Schuwer and Janssen (2018), Cronin (2018) and Weller (2014) that open education has many facets, and while open practices are a commendable objective worldwide, they cannot be imposed at the level of individuals. The findings of this research extend insights into the body of critical literature on open education which contends that OEP 'is complex, personal, contextual, and continually negotiated' (Cronin, 2018, p. 158). This study confirms what Cronin (2018) has already suggested, which is that individuals accept, understand, embrace, adopt and adapt or benefit from OER reuse in many different ways. However, in this study, the OER reuse is mostly invisible, because the five-step reuse process individuals engage with while using and adapting OER is confined to their private online environment, and also because they do not redistribute adapted and improved resources

in a public domain. Therefore, according to Koseoglu and Bozkurt (2018) who note that although it is not stated in the 2007 Cape Town Open Education Declaration, open practices are facilitated by digital technologies, and to Havemann (2016) and Cronin (2018) who refer to various forms of online collaborative practices to define OEP, the open educational practices described above, would not count as open. These practices are digital, in the sense that they occur in an online environment, but they are not open, in the sense that they do not constitute networked or social learning because the OU language teachers continue to share in closed spaces. Do inclusive, participatory and diverse educational practices need to be digital to be open?

Similarly, according to Wiley (2014), open pedagogy and openness are realised on condition that resources are retained, reused, revised, remixed, and redistributed. Wiley (2017) suggests that the transformation of education can only take place providing the five rights are exercised to allow for teachers to build on each other's knowledge and create new knowledge and recreate better quality resources. This study shows that the adapted resources produce improved materials that aim to address students' particular difficulties and needs. We can conjecture that these reworked resources make good educational materials for specific groups of distance language learners, and that teachers are providing these students with a better learning experience, even if the resources are not redistributed in public domains. In these situations, OER reuse have fostered improved (if not open) practices for small groups of students, and are evidence to support the OER movement's key goal, even though the newly created materials have not been redistributed in a public space.

Implications for the OEP and OER movement

Based on the reasons why teachers do not share resources or collaborate on OER in digital spaces, that emerged from our findings, we wonder about sustainability, if digital OEP do not occur in an environment as conducive to reuse and share as the Open University.

Language teachers at the OU create, use and adapt OER for their teaching, in that sense OER reuse is mainstream. They also regularly debate scholarly and pedagogic activities, collaborate and share resources, encourage students to take a more active role in their studies. They participate in MOOCs and professional development events that promote open educational practices, they strive to make their teaching more open, diverse and inclusive. And yet, they create direct connections and share resources only on OU platforms and nurture small networks. They do not seem to stretch the interactions beyond their known colleagues, engage in any form of online OER collaborative practices (unless paid), or distribute their resources other than on closed OU platforms. According to Ehlers (2011), the condition for sustainability within an institution is to foster a culture of openness. The Open University's mission is to be open to places, people and ideas and OU teachers embrace this mission. This study shows that this may not be enough for digital OEP to become mainstream, and that emerging OEP must be fostered or rewarded to improve engagement with OER (Ehlers, 2011). Finally, open educational practices are about capacity building (Bossu & Stagg, 2018), and thus it is critical for the future of OEP that institutions provide time and space for all OER users to become producers, by fostering a culture of sharing and collaborating through peer-led professional development sessions for a growing number of teachers to understand the benefits of OER reuse for teaching and learning, for their students and for themselves.

Conclusion and further research

This paper discusses OEP in the context of OER reuse in distance education and it reports on a study that is important because it focused on process rather than access with the view to address pedagogical and sustainability issues. The findings show that in a context conducive to openness, while OER reuse and adaptation is embedded in teaching and leads to emerging open educational practices, sharing and collaborating in public spaces are not common practice.

Further research is needed into teachers' attitudes and motivations about digital participatory culture (Cronin, 2018) and the participation divide (Hargittai and Walejko, 2008) between those individuals who post their content on the web and those who do not, those who enjoy networked and collaborative learning and those who do not (the 'open divide', Koseoglu and Bozkurt, 2019), in order to identify the cultural and social factors that are barriers to digital OEP that might increase higher engagement with OER and with open teaching and learning.

Notes on contributors

Hélène Pulker is a Senior Lecturer in French in the School of Languages and Applied Linguistics at The Open University, UK. Her research focuses on the reuse of OER for online language teaching, online and distance education and online language teachers' training. She holds a professional doctorate in education. She has presented her research at international conferences such as Eurocall, CALICO, OER and Open Education Global. She is a member of the editorial board of the French journal *Distance and Mediation of Knowledge* and a reviewer for several journals.

Agnes Kukulska-Hulme is Professor of Learning Technology and Communication in the Institute of Educational Technology at The Open University, UK, where she leads the Future Learning Research and Innovation Programme. Her research spans several inter-related fields including online distance education, mobile learning and language learning. Professor Kukulska-Hulme is on the Editorial Boards of academic journals including *ReCALL*, *System*, and the *International Journal of Mobile and Blended Learning*.

References

Beaven, T. (2014). Open Educational Resources and Language Teachers' Professional Practice: a case study of OER reuse. EdD Thesis. Milton Keynes, The Open University.

Bossu, C., & Stagg, A. (2018). The potential role of open educational practice policy in transforming Australian higher education. *Open Praxis*, 10(2), 145–157. Retrieved from: doi:10.5944/openpraxis.10.2.835

Bozkurt, A., Koseoglu, S. & Singh, L. (2019). An analysis of peer reviewed publications on openness in education in half a century: Trends and patterns in the open hemisphere, *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, (35)4, 78-98. Retrieved from: DOI: 10.14742/ajet.4252.

Browne, T., Holding, R., Howell, A. & Rodway-Dyer, S. (2010). The challenges of OER to Academic Practice. *Journal of Interactive Media in Education*. Retrieved from <http://doi.org/10.5334/2010-3>

Cape Town Open Education Declaration (2007). Cape Town open education declaration: Unlocking the promise of open educational resources. Retrieved from <https://www.capetowndeclaration.org/read-the-declaration>

Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory*, (2nd Ed.). London: Sage.

Comas-Quinn, A., Wild, J. & Carter, J. (2013). Leveraging passion for open practice. In *OER13: Creating a Virtuous Circle*, 26-27 March 2013, Nottingham, UK. Retrieved from: <http://oro.open.ac.uk/37551/2/432978F3.pdf>

Conole, G., & Ehlers, U.-D. (2010). Open educational practices: Unleashing the power of OER. In UNESCO Workshop on OER in Namibia. Windhoek. Retrieved from https://oerknowledgecloud.org/sites/oerknowledgecloud.org/files/OEP_Unleashing-the-power-of-OER.pdf

Coughlan, T., Pitt, R. and McAndrew, P. (2013) 'Building open bridges: collaborative remixing and reuse of open educational resources across organisations', in *2013 ACM SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems 'changing perspectives' (CHI 2013)*, 29 April - 02 May, Paris, France, pp. 991–1000.

Cox, G. & Trotter, H. (2017) 'Factors shaping lecturers' adoption of OER at three South African universities', in Hodgkinson-Williams, C. and Arinto, P. (eds.) *Adoption and impact of OER in the Global South*, pp. 287-347. Retrieved from: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.601935>.

Cronin, C. (2018). Openness and praxis: A situated study of academic staff meaning-making and decision-making with respect to openness and use of open educational practices in higher education. PhD Thesis. National University of Ireland, Galway, Ireland. Retrieved from: <https://go-gn.net/theses/>

Cronin, C., & MacLaren, I. (2018). Conceptualising OEP: A review of theoretical and empirical literature in open educational practices. *Open Praxis*, 10(2), 127–143.

Retrieved from: doi:10.5944/openpraxis.10.2.825

de Langen, F. (2018). Sustainability of open education through collaboration.

International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, (19)5, 95-111.

De Rosa, R. & Jhangiani, R. (2017). Open pedagogy. In E. Mays (Ed.), *A guide to making open textbooks with students*. Retrieved from

<https://press.rebus.community/makingopentextbookswithstudents/chapter/open-pedagogy/>

Downes, S. (2007). Models for Sustainable Open Educational Resources.

Interdisciplinary Journal of E-Learning and Learning Objects, 3(1), 29-44. Retrived

from <http://www.editlib.org/p/44796>

Ehlers, U. (2011). Extending the territory: From Open Educational Resources to Open Educational Practices. *Journal of Open, Flexible, and Distance Learning*, 15(2), 1-10.

Retrieved from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1079969.pdf>

Glaser, B. (2005) 'The Impact of Symbolic Interaction on Grounded Theory', *Grounded Theory Review*, 4(2). Retrieved from:

<http://groundedtheoryreview.com/2005/03/30/1575/>

Hargittai, E. & Walejko, G. (2008). The participation divide: content creation and sharing in the digital age. *Information, communication and society*, 11(2), 239-256.

Havemann, L. (2016). Open educational resources. In M. A. Peters (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational philosophy and theory* (pp. 1–7). Singapore: Springer

Hegarty, B. (2015). Attributes of Open Pedagogy: A Model for Using Open Educational Resources. *Educational technology*, 3-13. Retrieved from https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/c/ca/Ed_Tech_Hegarty_2015_article_attributes_of_open_pedagogy.pdf

Hodgkinson-Williams, C. (2010) 'Benefits and challenges of OER for higher education institutions', in *the Open Educational Resources (OER) workshop for Heads of Commonwealth Universities*, Capetown, South Africa. Retrieved from: http://oasis.col.org/bitstream/handle/11599/3042/2010_Hodgkinson-Williams_Benefits-Challenges-of-OER-for-HE-Institutions.pdf.

Kern, R. (2006). Perspectives on Technology in Learning and Teaching Languages. *TESOL Quaterly*, 40(1), 183-210.

Knox, J. (2013). Five critiques of the open educational resources movement. *Teacher in Higher Education*, 18(8), 821-832.

Koseoglu, S. & Bozkurt, A. (2018). An exploratory literature review on open educational practices. *Distance Education*, 39(4), 441-461. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2018.1520042>

Kozinska, K., Kursun, E., Wilson, T., McAndrew, P., Scanlon, E., Jones, A., Cagiltay, K. (2010) 'Are Open Educational Resources the future of e-learning?', in Gülsecen, S. and Ayvaz Reis, Z. (eds.) *FutureLearning 2010. Third International Conference on Innovations in Learning for the Future 2010: eLearning, Proceedings*, Istanbul Kültür University Publication No: 125, pp. 34-44. Retrieved from: http://oro.open.ac.uk/21123/1/Kozinska_et_al.pdf.

Mishra, S. (2017). Open educational resources: removing barriers from within. *Distance Education*, 38(3), 369-380.

Naidu, S. (2016). The case for open educational practice. *Distance Education*, 37, 1–3. doi:10.1080/ 01587919.2016.1157010

Schön, D. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner – How Professionals Think in Action*. London, Temple Smith.

Schuwer, R. & Janssen, B. (2018). Adoption of sharing and reuse of open resources by educators in higher education institutions in the Netherlands: A qualitative research of practices, motives, and conditions. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 19(3), 151-171. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v19i3.3390>

Tomlinson, B. (2011). *Developing materials for language teaching*. London: Continuum.

Weller, M. (2014). *The Battle For Open: How openness won and why it doesn't feel like victory*. London: Ubiquity Press. Retrieved from <https://www.ubiquitypress.com/site/books/10.5334/bam/>

Weller, M., de los Arcos, B., Farrow, R., Pitt, R. & McAndrew, P. (2015). The Impact of OER on Teaching and Learning Practice. *Open Praxis*, 7(4), 351-361. Retrieved from: <http://oro.open.ac.uk/44963/1/227-1106-2-PB-3.pdf>

Weller, M., Jordan, K., DeVries, I., & Rolfe, V. (2018). Mapping the open education landscape: citation network analysis of historical open and distance education research. *Open Praxis*, 10(2), 109-126.

Wild, J. (2012) 'OER Engagement Study: Promoting OER Reuse Among Academics', Research Report from the funded project. Retrieved from: https://askawild.files.wordpress.com/2017/09/oer-engagement-study-joanna-wild_full-research-report.pdf.

Wiley, D. (2014, March 5). The Access Compromise and the 5th R [Blog post], *Iterating toward openness*. Retrieved from: <http://opencontent.org/blog/archives/3221>

Wiley, D. (2017, April 4). How is Open Pedagogy different? [Blog post], *Iterating toward openness*. Retrived from: <https://opencontent.org/blog/archives/4943>

Wiley, D. (2018). Defining OER-enabled pedagogy. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, (9)4, 133-147.

Wiley, D. & Green, C. (2012). Why Openness in Education?. In D. Oblinger (Ed.), *Game Changers: Education and Information Technologies* (pp. 81-89). EDUCAUSE. Retrieved from: <https://library.educause.edu/resources/2012/5/chapter-6-why-openness-in-education>

Wills, S. & Pegler, C. (2016). A Deeper Understanding of Reuse: Learning Designs, Activities, Resources and their Contexts. *Journal of Interactive Media in Education*, 1. Retrived from: <http://doi.org/10.5334/jime.405>