Scholedge International Journal of *Multidisciplinary & Allied Studies*
ISSN 2394-336X Vol. 13, Issue 01 (2026)
DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.19085/sijmas130101

Open Educational Resources and Knowledge Democratization in Global Higher Education

Suriya Rungroj
European International University, Paris, France

ABSTRACT

Open Educational Resources (OER) have steadily reshaped how knowledge is produced, shared, and accessed across global higher education systems. Rooted in principles of openness, reuse, and redistribution, OER hold real potential to bridge educational inequalities between high-income and low-income countries. This paper examines the concept of OER, its historical origins, and the ways in which it connects to broader debates about knowledge democratization. Drawing on peer-reviewed literature, UNESCO policy documents, and documented institutional initiatives, the paper reviews the landscape of OER adoption, the barriers that continue to constrain it, and the policy frameworks that either support or impede its growth. Special attention is given to the Global South, where the gap between access and aspiration remains wide. The paper concludes that OER, while not a standalone solution, can substantially expand educational access when embedded in supportive policy environments, sustained by institutional commitment, and paired with investments in digital infrastructure. Future scholarship should focus on pedagogical effectiveness of OER, faculty adoption patterns, and quality assurance mechanisms in open learning ecosystems.

Keywords: Open educational resources, knowledge democratization, higher education, Global South, UNESCO, digital equity, open licensing

INTRODUCTION

The question of who gets to access knowledge has been at the center of educational debates for decades. Universities, libraries, and academic publishers have long controlled the gates through which knowledge flows. That system worked reasonably well in an era when printing and distribution costs justified it. But the rise of the internet changed the economics of knowledge sharing in ways that those older structures have been slow to accommodate. Open Educational Resources, commonly referred to as OER, emerged from that shift as a direct response to the restrictive and expensive nature of conventional educational materials.

The term "open educational resources" was first formally used at a 2002 UNESCO forum in Paris, convened to assess the growing impact of MIT's then-recently launched OpenCourseWare initiative (UNESCO, 2002). Since that moment, the concept has grown considerably in scope and ambition. Governments, international organizations, universities, and independent educators have all invested in producing and distributing OER. By 2019, UNESCO had adopted its *Recommendation on Open Educational Resources*, marking the first formal international policy commitment to OER at the intergovernmental level (UNESCO, 2019).

Despite this growth, OER has not achieved its full democratizing potential. Access to OER remains uneven across regions, institutions, and disciplines. Faculty adoption continues to be shaped by concerns about quality, awareness, and institutional support. In much of the Global South, infrastructure limitations

restrict what open access can actually deliver. This paper examines these tensions by reviewing the literature on OER in global higher education, focusing specifically on its relationship to knowledge democratization as both a concept and a practice.

The paper is organized as follows. It begins by defining OER and reviewing the 5R framework that has become the standard way of describing what "openness" means in educational contexts. It then traces the historical development of OER from early institutional experiments to international policy adoption. From there, it discusses the theoretical connections between OER and knowledge democratization, followed by an analysis of adoption patterns, persistent barriers, and supporting policy frameworks. A dedicated section examines OER in the Global South before the paper moves to a discussion of implications and a set of conclusions.

DEFINING OPEN EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES: THE 5R FRAMEWORK

The most widely accepted definition of OER comes from UNESCO, which describes them as "teaching, learning and research materials in any medium, digital or otherwise, that reside in the public domain or have been released under an open license that permits no-cost access, use, adaptation and redistribution by others with no or limited restrictions" (UNESCO, 2019, p. 4). This definition is intentionally broad. It covers textbooks, lecture notes, syllabi, assessments, simulations, video lectures, and any other resource that supports the educational process.

The practical meaning of OER, however, is better understood through what David Wiley, one of the field's most cited scholars, has articulated as the 5R framework. Originally proposed as four permissions and later expanded, the 5Rs describe what an open license actually allows a user to do with a resource: Retain (make, own, and control a copy), Reuse (use the content in a wide range of ways), Revise (adapt, adjust, modify, or alter the content itself), Remix (combine the original or revised content with other material to create something new), and Redistribute (share copies of the original content, revisions, or remixes with others) (Wiley & Hilton, 2018).

These five permissions form a hierarchy of openness. A resource that only permits free access but prohibits modification is, strictly speaking, not fully open. The Creative Commons licensing system, which underpins most OER, provides a range of options that grant different combinations of these permissions. A Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license is considered the most open, requiring only that the original author be credited. More restrictive variants add conditions such as prohibiting commercial use (CC BY-NC) or requiring that derivatives be shared under the same license (CC BY-SA).

This licensing architecture matters because it directly shapes how OER can be used. A teacher in Kenya who wants to translate a textbook originally written in English into Swahili needs a license that permits revision. A university in Bangladesh that wants to integrate OER modules into a paid online certificate program needs clarity on commercial use provisions. Wiley and Hilton (2018) argue that the licensing permissions are not abstract legal technicalities but the practical foundation on which open pedagogy is built.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF OPEN EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES

The intellectual roots of OER run deeper than the 2002 UNESCO forum. The open-source software movement, which gained momentum through the 1980s and 1990s, established the cultural and legal precedents that later OER advocates would draw from heavily. The idea that software code, and by extension, educational content, could be shared, modified, and improved collaboratively without financial exchange was genuinely radical at the time (Weller, 2014). When MIT launched OpenCourseWare in 2001, publishing course materials from over 2,000 courses freely online, it did so with the explicit goal of

demonstrating that world-class educational content did not need to be locked behind tuition and enrollment.

The 2002 UNESCO forum that followed formalized the concept, introducing the term OER into the international policy vocabulary and sparking conversations across national education ministries (UNESCO, 2002). Several years later, the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, which had co-funded MIT OpenCourseWare, commissioned a major review of the OER movement that catalogued its achievements, mapped the emerging ecosystem of repositories and producers, and identified areas where sustained support was needed (Atkins et al., 2007). That report helped establish OER as a legitimate field of study and policy, not just a fringe experiment.

The Cape Town Open Education Declaration of 2007 was another watershed moment. Convened in Cape Town, South Africa, the meeting brought together educators, technologists, and policy advocates who collectively argued that the internet had created an unprecedented opportunity to democratize education on a global scale. The declaration called on educators to release their resources openly, on institutions to adopt open licensing policies, and on governments to require that publicly funded educational materials be made freely available (Cape Town Open Education Declaration, 2007).

The following decade saw rapid institutional proliferation. The OECD published its analysis of OER opportunities and challenges in 2006, situating the movement within broader debates about knowledge economies and public investment in higher education (Hylén, 2006). The Commonwealth of Learning, which had long focused on distance and open education across Commonwealth nations, developed its own OER guidelines and promoted adoption across member states (Commonwealth of Learning & UNESCO, 2011). Table 1 below provides an overview of some of the most documented OER initiatives that emerged in the period from 2002 to 2012.

Table 1. Key Global OER Initiatives and Their Institutional Origins

Initiative	Year Launched	Founding Organization	Geographic Focus
MIT OpenCourseWare	2002	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Global
African Virtual University OER	2005	African Virtual University	Sub-Saharan Africa
OpenLearn	2006	The Open University, UK	Global
OER Africa	2007	Saide (South Africa)	Africa
Khan Academy	2008	Salman Khan / Non-profit	Global
National Programme on Technology Enhanced Learning (NPTEL)	2003	IITs and IISc, India	India / South Asia
OpenStax	2012	Rice University	Global
Commonwealth of Learning OER	2000s	Commonwealth of Learning	Commonwealth Nations

Note. Information drawn from institutional documentation and secondary literature, including Atkins et al. (2007), Commonwealth of Learning & UNESCO (2011), and Orr et al. (2015).

By the 2010s, the movement had also intersected with the rise of Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs), though the relationship between MOOCs and OER is not always straightforward. Platforms like Coursera, edX, and Udacity attracted enormous media attention, but many of their courses were not released under open licenses and thus did not technically qualify as OER. Weller (2014) argued that this period exposed a fundamental tension in the openness movement: the values that animated OER advocates were not always shared by the commercial platforms that adopted the language of openness to describe their products.

OER AND KNOWLEDGE DEMOCRATIZATION: THEORETICAL CONNECTIONS

Knowledge democratization, as a concept, describes the redistribution of knowledge production and access from elite institutions and privileged individuals toward broader populations. The term draws on democratic theory, arguing that participation in the creation and use of knowledge is not merely a practical matter but a political and ethical one. Scholars in education, philosophy, and sociology have long debated how educational institutions reproduce social hierarchies rather than challenge them. From Paulo Freire's critique of the "banking model" of education to Pierre Bourdieu's work on cultural capital, the theoretical literature on education and power provides a rich backdrop against which OER can be understood.

OER sits at the intersection of this literature with more practical policy debates about educational access. Orr et al. (2015) argue that OER can function as a catalyst for educational change by decoupling access to knowledge from financial and institutional gatekeeping. If a student in rural Mozambique can access the same lecture materials as a student at Oxford, the argument goes, then the monopoly of elite institutions over quality higher education is meaningfully weakened. This is an appealing argument, but it rests on assumptions that deserve scrutiny.

Hodgkinson-Williams and Trotter (2018) offer a more grounded theoretical framework, one rooted in social justice rather than technological optimism. Their framework argues that OER's democratizing potential depends not on the existence of open resources alone, but on whether those resources are genuinely accessible to marginalized communities in terms of language, culture, digital infrastructure, and pedagogical fit. A resource that is freely available online but only in English, only on platforms that require reliable broadband, and only designed for learners familiar with Western academic conventions is open in a technical sense but not democratizing in any meaningful social sense.

Deimann and Farrow (2013) approach the same problem from a philosophical angle, drawing on the German concept of Bildung, which describes the process of self-cultivation through engagement with knowledge. They argue that OER, when designed and used thoughtfully, supports a model of education that treats learners as active participants in knowledge production rather than passive consumers of pre-packaged content. This perspective aligns with constructivist learning theory and with Wiley and Hilton's (2018) concept of OER-enabled pedagogy, which describes instructional approaches that are only possible when educational resources are openly licensed and can be modified by students themselves.

Taken together, these theoretical perspectives suggest that OER is best understood not as a technology or a product category, but as a set of values and practices that may or may not, depending on context, produce more equitable outcomes in higher education. The theoretical potential is real. The conditions under which it can be realized are specific and demanding.

OER ADOPTION IN GLOBAL HIGHER EDUCATION

Patterns of OER adoption across global higher education are uneven, shaped by institutional culture, government policy, technological readiness, and the awareness and attitudes of individual faculty members. The most well-documented adoption has occurred in North America and Western Europe,

where institutional repositories, open textbook initiatives, and faculty development programs have created relatively supportive environments.

In the United States, the open textbook movement has been particularly visible. OpenStax, launched by Rice University in 2012, has produced peer-reviewed open textbooks in subjects ranging from introductory biology to statistics and US history. By the mid-2010s, the platform had documented millions of students saving on textbook costs annually. This model addressed a specific and well-documented problem: the rising cost of commercial textbooks, which had become a material barrier to student success at many American institutions.

In the United Kingdom, The Open University has long been a leader in open education. Its OpenLearn platform, launched in 2006, made substantial portions of its course content freely available to anyone with internet access, regardless of enrollment status. The institution's model demonstrated that a fully accredited, research-active university could commit to openness without abandoning financial sustainability (Weller, 2014).

Asia presents a more complex picture. India's National Programme on Technology Enhanced Learning (NPTEL), a collaboration between the Indian Institutes of Technology and the Indian Institute of Science, has produced thousands of hours of video lectures in science, engineering, and management subjects. These materials have reached millions of learners both in India and internationally, demonstrating that a large, resource-constrained country can build a substantial OER infrastructure through coordinated institutional partnerships. China, too, has invested in national OER programs through its Ministry of Education, though access policies and licensing frameworks vary across platforms (Dhanarajan & Porter, 2013).

Adoption in sub-Saharan Africa has been driven in part by international partnerships and donor funding rather than purely domestic institutional initiative. Organizations such as OER Africa, a program of the South African Institute for Distance Education, have worked with universities across the continent to develop locally relevant open content and build the capacity of faculty to produce and use OER (Hodgkinson-Williams & Trotter, 2018). The African Virtual University's OER initiative similarly sought to address the scarcity of high-quality teaching materials in African higher education by producing and sharing open content across member institutions.

BARRIERS TO OER ADOPTION

Despite the growth in OER production and the strength of the policy case for open education, adoption remains limited in many institutional and national contexts. The literature identifies a consistent set of barriers that cut across geography and institutional type, though their severity and combination vary by context. Table 2 below summarizes the principal categories of barriers documented in the research literature.

Table 2. Principal Barriers to OER Adoption in Higher Education

Barrier Category	Description	Cited By
Technical Infrastructure	Inadequate internet connectivity, low bandwidth, and limited device access in low-income settings	Butcher (2011); Mtebe & Raisamo (2014)
Faculty Awareness	Many educators remain unaware of OER repositories or licensing frameworks	Hylén (2006); Orr et al. (2015)
Language Barriers	Dominant OER content exists in English, limiting reach in multilingual regions	UNESCO (2019); Dhanarajan & Porter (2013)
Quality Perceptions	Faculty skepticism about peer-reviewed status and academic rigor of freely available materials	Weller (2014); Atkins et al. (2007)
Institutional Policy Gaps	Absence of formal OER policies at university level discourages adoption	Commonwealth of Learning & UNESCO (2011)
Intellectual Property Confusion	Misunderstanding of Creative Commons licenses leads to non-use or misuse	Wiley & Hilton (2018)

Note. Compiled from Atkins et al. (2007), Butcher (2011), Commonwealth of Learning & UNESCO (2011), Dhanarajan & Porter (2013), Hylén (2006), Mtebe & Raisamo (2014), Orr et al. (2015), UNESCO (2019), Weller (2014), and Wiley & Hilton (2018).

TECHNICAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE BARRIERS

Infrastructure limitations remain the most fundamental barrier in low-income country contexts. Mtebe and Raisamo (2014) conducted one of the more systematic studies of OER adoption barriers in Africa, surveying instructors at Tanzanian universities and finding that unreliable electricity, low internet bandwidth, and inadequate hardware were the most commonly reported constraints on OER use. This finding has been replicated across multiple African and South Asian contexts. A resource that exists online is effectively inaccessible to a lecturer in a rural university campus where the internet drops out regularly and downloading large files is impractical.

The infrastructure gap also matters for production, not just consumption. Creating high-quality OER, particularly video-based content, requires recording equipment, editing software, and reliable upload speeds. Faculty at well-resourced universities in high-income countries can produce such content relatively easily. Faculty at underfunded institutions in low-income countries face far greater obstacles, which means the geography of OER production tends to mirror the existing geography of global academic inequality.

AWARENESS, INCENTIVES, AND INSTITUTIONAL CULTURE

Beyond infrastructure, Hylén (2006) identified lack of awareness as a persistent barrier even in contexts where technical access is not the primary obstacle. Many faculty members, particularly those who trained before OER became widespread, have simply not encountered the concept or have limited understanding of where to find open resources and how to evaluate their quality. This is not a failure of individual educators but a systemic gap in professional development and institutional communication.

Incentive structures in academic institutions also work against OER adoption. Faculty promotions and tenure decisions at research universities typically reward peer-reviewed publications, not the production

of open educational materials. Investing time in creating or adapting OER can therefore seem professionally costly, particularly for junior faculty who are under pressure to publish. Orr et al. (2015) argue that until institutions recognize OER contribution in formal recognition and reward systems, individual-level adoption will remain episodic rather than systemic.

QUALITY CONCERNS

Faculty skepticism about the quality of open resources is well documented and not entirely without basis. Unlike peer-reviewed academic publications, OER varies enormously in quality. Some repositories host materials that have been carefully reviewed and updated; others accumulate resources without any quality control process. Weller (2014) noted the irony that the very openness that makes OER politically appealing also makes quality assurance more difficult, since there is no single editorial or institutional authority responsible for the content in most open repositories.

This concern has prompted efforts to develop quality frameworks specifically for OER. The OECD report by Orr et al. (2015) reviewed several national and institutional quality assurance approaches, noting that peer review, user ratings, and institutional endorsement are all used in different contexts, but that no single standard has emerged. Atkins et al. (2007) had earlier identified quality assurance as one of the field's central unresolved challenges, and the subsequent two decades of development have not produced a definitive solution.

POLICY FRAMEWORKS GOVERNING OER

The policy environment for OER has matured substantially since the early 2000s. UNESCO's 2019 Recommendation on Open Educational Resources represents the clearest and most authoritative statement of international policy commitment to OER. The Recommendation was adopted by UNESCO Member States and calls on governments to support the development and use of OER, to adopt open licensing for publicly funded educational materials, to build technical infrastructure, and to foster inclusive knowledge societies (UNESCO, 2019). It is the first intergovernmental instrument specifically dedicated to OER and carries significant symbolic weight even where implementation remains incomplete.

The Commonwealth of Learning, which has consistently promoted open and distance learning across its 54 member states, published guidelines for OER in higher education in 2011 in partnership with UNESCO. These guidelines addressed the practical dimensions of institutional policy, including copyright frameworks, repository development, faculty development, and quality assurance (Commonwealth of Learning & UNESCO, 2011). They have been widely referenced in subsequent national and institutional policy discussions.

At the national level, policy approaches to OER vary considerably. South Africa has been among the more active policy environments on the African continent, with the Department of Higher Education and Training explicitly referencing OER in its distance education policy frameworks. India's National Education Policy of 2020, while not exclusively focused on OER, emphasized the importance of digital content and open access as part of its broader modernization agenda. In the United States, federal agencies have experimented with open licensing requirements for publicly funded educational projects, though comprehensive national OER policy has not emerged.

Butcher (2011) argued that policy frameworks, while necessary, are insufficient on their own. Implementation requires funding, institutional capacity, and sustained political will. The gap between well-drafted policies and actual change in classroom practice remains significant in many national contexts. UNESCO's follow-up work on the 2019 Recommendation has acknowledged this implementation gap and called for more rigorous monitoring of member state progress.

OER IN THE GLOBAL SOUTH: EQUITY AND ACCESS

The stakes of OER adoption are nowhere higher than in the Global South, where higher education systems are under simultaneous pressure to expand enrollment, improve quality, and reduce cost. Sub-Saharan Africa has the lowest tertiary enrollment rate of any world region, and the demand for higher education is projected to grow significantly over the coming decades as the region's young population grows. Latin America and South and Southeast Asia face their own versions of the same challenge: systems struggling to meet growing demand with limited resources.

In this context, OER represents a potential mechanism for improving teaching and learning without requiring proportional increases in expenditure on commercial content. Dhanarajan and Porter (2013) documented the variety of ways in which Asian universities had begun to engage with OER, from informal faculty sharing to formal national programs. Their analysis showed that adoption was most successful where it was connected to concrete institutional goals, whether improving student outcomes in specific subjects, reducing dependence on imported textbooks, or building the capacity of teaching staff.

Hodgkinson-Williams and Trotter's (2018) social justice framework is particularly relevant to this context. They distinguish between OER that is merely "available" and OER that is genuinely "accessible" to learners in specific social and cultural contexts. Availability is a function of licensing and distribution. Accessibility depends on language, cultural relevance, digital literacy, connectivity, and the pedagogical fit between the resource and the learner. A statistics textbook written by an American professor, released under CC BY, and hosted on an open platform is technically available to a first-year student in Ghana. Whether it is genuinely useful to that student depends on factors that availability alone cannot address.

Language is one of the most significant of these factors. The overwhelming majority of high-quality OER is produced in English, followed at some distance by Spanish, French, and a handful of other widely spoken languages. The implications for learners in multilingual regions are significant. A student studying at a Francophone West African university may find some French-language OER but is unlikely to find materials in the local languages that many students speak at home. Translating and localizing existing OER is technically permitted under most open licenses but requires capacity and resources that many institutions in the Global South do not currently have.

These challenges do not negate the value of OER for the Global South. They do suggest that the standard narrative, in which OER flows from well-resourced producers in the North to grateful recipients in the South, is both empirically incomplete and politically problematic. Genuine knowledge democratization requires not just open access to existing content but the capacity to produce new knowledge from within communities that have historically been positioned as consumers rather than creators of academic knowledge.

DISCUSSION

The literature reviewed in this paper tells a story of real progress and persistent limitation. OER has moved from a marginal institutional experiment to a recognized field of international policy in roughly two decades. The legal infrastructure for open licensing is well established. The policy case for OER has been articulated at the highest levels of international governance. Repositories, platforms, and institutional programs exist in most world regions. These are not small achievements.

And yet the democratizing potential of OER has been only partially realized. Access to OER remains shaped by the same inequalities that shape access to education more broadly: wealth, geography, language, and the presence or absence of institutional support. Faculty adoption is still the exception rather than the norm in most higher education systems. Quality assurance remains inconsistent. The production of OER is concentrated in institutions that already have the resources and prestige to produce it, which means the

content of the open knowledge commons tends to reflect the perspectives and priorities of those institutions.

This does not mean that OER has failed. It means that OER is a tool whose effectiveness depends heavily on the context in which it is used. Wiley and Hilton's (2018) concept of OER-enabled pedagogy points in a useful direction, suggesting that the most interesting question is not whether OER is available, but what instructors and students actually do with it. When open licenses are used to invite students to revise, critique, and improve course materials, OER becomes a vehicle for student agency and active learning. When OER simply substitutes for a commercial textbook without changing the pedagogical approach, the educational value of openness is limited to cost savings alone, which are real but hardly transformative.

The implications for institutional policy are fairly clear from the literature. Institutions that want to move beyond symbolic commitment to OER need to do several things simultaneously: develop formal OER policies that include open licensing requirements for publicly funded content; provide faculty with professional development support for finding, evaluating, and producing OER; recognize OER contribution in academic workload and promotion systems; invest in the technical infrastructure needed to host and access open content; and engage with the question of language and cultural accessibility rather than assuming that English-language OER is globally adequate.

The implications for international policy are equally straightforward, though harder to act on. UNESCO's 2019 Recommendation is a strong foundation. The gap between that foundation and meaningful change at the classroom level is substantial and will not close without sustained investment and accountability. Donor-funded OER projects that are not embedded in institutional capacity-building tend to produce content that is used during the project period and quietly abandoned afterward. Sustainable OER ecosystems require the same thing that sustainable educational systems require: long-term institutional commitment, trained personnel, and financial resources.

CONCLUSION

Open Educational Resources occupy a genuinely important place in contemporary debates about equity, access, and the purpose of higher education. They represent a practical mechanism through which the principles of knowledge democratization can be translated into institutional practice. The evidence base, while still developing, supports the view that OER can reduce costs for students, expand access to high-quality materials, and, under the right pedagogical conditions, support more active and engaged forms of learning.

At the same time, the persistent barriers documented in this paper are real and should temper expectations. OER is not a technological fix for educational inequality. Infrastructure gaps, language barriers, faculty skepticism, and misaligned institutional incentives all constrain adoption in ways that cannot be addressed through licensing alone. Knowledge democratization, if it is to be meaningful, requires not just open content but the conditions under which diverse communities can create, adapt, and use that content on their own terms.

Future research should focus on several areas that remain underdeveloped. The pedagogical effectiveness of OER, particularly in diverse learning contexts across the Global South, requires more rigorous empirical investigation. Faculty adoption patterns and the institutional factors that influence them are better understood than they were a decade ago but still not well enough to guide effective policy design. The quality assurance problem, which the field has acknowledged for twenty years without resolving, calls for more creative and perhaps more locally governed solutions than the literature has so far produced.

The 2019 UNESCO Recommendation on OER offers a policy platform that, if taken seriously by member states, could accelerate progress on all of these fronts. Whether governments choose to act on it with the seriousness it warrants will depend on how strongly the case for educational equity is made, and by whom, in the political environments that shape education policy in each national context. That is ultimately a question not about technology or licensing but about values and political will.

REFERENCES

Atkins, D. E., Brown, J. S., & Hammond, A. L. (2007). A review of the open educational resources (OER) movement: Achievements, challenges, and new opportunities. *William and Flora Hewlett Foundation.*

Butcher, N. (2011). A basic guide to open educational resources (OER). *UNESCO & Commonwealth of Learning.*

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

Commonwealth of Learning, & UNESCO. (2011). Guidelines for open educational resources (OER) in higher education. *Commonwealth of Learning*.

Deimann, M., & Farrow, R. (2013). Rethinking OER and their use: Open education as Bildung. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 14(3), 344–360. https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v14i3.1370

Dhanarajan, G., & Porter, D. (Eds.). (2013). Open educational resources: An Asian perspective. *Commonwealth of Learning & OER Asia*.

Hodgkinson-Williams, C., & Trotter, H. (2018). A social justice framework for understanding open educational resources and practices in the Global South. *Journal of Learning for Development,* 5(3), 204–224.

Hylén, J. (2006). Open educational resources: Opportunities and challenges. *OECD Centre for Educational Research and Innovation.*

Mtebe, J. S., & Raisamo, R. (2014). Challenges and instructors' intention to adopt and use open educational resources in higher education in Tanzania. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 15(1). https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v15i1.1687

Orr, D., Rimini, M., & Van Damme, D. (2015). Open educational resources: A catalyst for innovation. *OECD Publishing*. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264247543-en

UNESCO. (2002). Forum on the impact of open courseware for higher education in developing countries: Final report. *United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization*.

UNESCO. (2019). Recommendation on open educational resources (OER). *United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.*

Weller, M. (2014). The battle for open: How openness won and why it doesn't feel like victory. *Ubiquity Press.* https://doi.org/10.5334/bam

Wiley, D., & Hilton, J. L. (2018). Defining OER-enabled pedagogy. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 19(4). https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v19i4.3601