

Open Peer Review

Larson, A. (2022, October). [First review of the article Doctoral students' perspective on textbooks and Open Educational Resources: Needs, impact, and future directions, by M. Hosoi, B. McGeary, & L. Munip]. Journal of Open Educational Resources in Higher Education, 1(1), 38-44.
doi:10.13001/joerhe.v1i1.7205

Reviewer: Amanda Larson

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Review 1 of 2 (Completed 2022-06-21)

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?

This article is in scope for the Journal of Open Educational Resources in Higher Education as it's a study about doctoral students and their experience with OER in their Education degree program.

Organization

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

The article proceeds logically and follows the outlined format in the submissions guidelines for the journal and is almost 6000 words.

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?

The methodology seems fine, inductive analysis through open coding is valid for coding interview data. The sample size seems small (14), but the authors don't provide data about how many students are in the doctoral programs in Education, so it's impossible to tell if it is statistically significant.

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.

Overall, the article doesn't read very homogeneously. There are places like the Introduction and Literature review that read very stilted, and other places like the Methods and Results, that read with more flow. I wonder if it's suffering from having multiple authors and not being edited to have a more homogenous voice. It could also be over-edited to make it fit within the word limit, based on the lack of transitions throughout the article.

Application:

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

While situated in the scholarly conversation through the literature review, the authors don't follow up with the convention of suggesting how others might use their research or where it can be expanded upon, and only talk loosely about how it will inform their practice at their institution.

What are the stronger points/qualities of the article?

Some of the stronger points of this article are:

Fills a gap in the literature by studying the impact OER have on graduate / doctoral students

The quotations from the grad students that came out of the interviews

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

The flow of the article is stilted, different sections read with different voices, a lack of connection back to how this applies to the broader discipline/how folks might use this information to inform their practice/what gaps still remain. It could be strengthened by unifying the voice of the article so it sounds like one author instead of sections written in different voices, and by adding in how librarians/libraries could use this research or build upon this research.

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?

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

1-Weak Accept

Open Peer Review

Larson, A. (2022, October). [Second review of the article Doctoral students' perspective on textbooks and Open Educational Resources: Needs, impact, and future directions, by M. Hosoi, B. McGearry, & L. Munip]. Journal of Open Educational Resources in Higher Education, 1(1), xxx-xxx. DOI

Reviewer: Amanda Larson

Recommendation: Accept Submission

Review 2 of 2 (Completed 2022-08-22)

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?

Yes, absolutely. The article discusses original research about doctoral students in an education program and OER. The doctoral student voices captured here are especially important and fills a gap that the community doesn't hear much about.

Organization

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

Yes, the article is much improved! The organization now follows a logical progression and flows smoothly from one section to the next.

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?

The research method seems appropriate for the problem the authors seek to address. The use of open coding and inductive analysis of the data is appropriate.

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.

Much improved! This article now reads more homogeneously and cohesively throughout. Some of the block quotes look awkwardly spaced but that can be corrected in the copy editing phase.

Application:

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

Capturing the perspectives of doctoral students in this article is helpful to all academic libraries seeking to do outreach to grad students, and the authors suggest how others can build on the work they've done at the end of the article.

What are the stronger points/qualities of the article?

Voices of doctoral students are strongly highlighted throughout the article which gives voice to a much underrepresented group in the body of existing libraries and OER literature.

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

None of the conclusions are particularly new (a part from less emphasis on cost savings)? But they do corroborate what other research has found within a different group that is often underrepresented in library outreach and research.

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?

Highly 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
