

Open Peer Review

Holdsworth, L. (2022, October). [Review of the article Just one textbook? Student perceptions and preferences for open and affordable educational resources, by E. Nelson & C. Riehman-Murphy]. Journal of Open Educational Resources in Higher Education, 1(1), 264-267 doi:10.13001/joerhe.v1i1.7173

Reviewer: Liz Holdsworth

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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 within scope of JOERHE.

Organization

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

The article proceeds logically.

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?

There are some elements in the methodology that could be strengthened.

It would be helpful context to know how many total surveys were sent out, how many responses came in each year/semester, and whether similar surveys on course materials have been deployed at Penn. I had to read this paper twice to understand how the surveys were deployed - over a three year period and not at the end of a three year stint. A low survey response rate is not unexpected from students, so please acknowledge if that is the case.

It may be impossible, due to the number of responses, to see if there are any significant differences in the semesters. However, it would be helpful to see if there are other factors in responses in addition to Covid-19. Hypothetically, spring semester students find materials easier to access due to more experience with the LMS.

Please describe how the open ended responses were coded. There are varying methodologies. If you did not choose a specific methodology, please summarize the steps you took.

You have highlighted relevant survey responses for this paper, which makes sense as it is an extensive survey. Would it be possible to include the full responses as an appendix or linked in the Google Drive with the instrument?

Wherever possible, please create a graph or infographic to showcase your data. The data visualization as well as prose description will help with understanding.

While not necessary for revision, the authors may find the following papers of interest:

<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1184998>

<https://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/2462>

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.

Writing style and references were good.

Application:

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

Yes, this article is applicable. The conclusion that the students just need the documents right in front of them in the LMS is invaluable.

What are the stronger points/qualities of the article?

This article takes an important look at the "how" of student access and balances it with expense. The authors excellently describe the opportunities for social justice in the curriculum and the collapse of the framing of different information sources. The article correctly focuses on a smaller portion of the survey results than the total.

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

There are some clarifications in the survey methodology that would strengthen the paper that I described. Graphs explaining the data would also be helpful. .

Peer Review Ranking: Scope

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

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

2-Accept
