



# Open Educational Resources in the Indian Context: A Comparative Empirical Analysis with Developed and Developing Countries

Sarbjee Prasad<sup>1</sup>, Atul Kumar Srivastava<sup>2</sup>, Anand Kumar<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Amity School of Information Technology, Amity University Jharkhand, Ranchi, India.

<sup>2</sup>Amity Institute of Applied Sciences, Amity University Jharkhand, Ranchi, India.

<sup>3</sup>Amity School of Engineering & Technology, Amity University Jharkhand, Ranchi, India

**To Cite this Article:** Sarbjee Prasad<sup>1</sup>, Atul Kumar Srivastava<sup>2</sup>, Anand Kumar<sup>3</sup>, “Open Educational Resources in the Indian Context: A Comparative Empirical Analysis with Developed and Developing Countries”, *Indian Journal of Computer Science and Technology*, Volume 05, Issue 01 (January-April 2026), PP: 183-185.



Copyright: ©2026 This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/); Which Permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

**Abstract:** Open Educational Resources (OER) have emerged as a transformative mechanism for expanding access to knowledge, reducing educational costs, and supporting pedagogical innovation worldwide. Since the adoption of the UNESCO (2019) Recommendation on OER, governments and higher education institutions have increasingly incorporated open content into national digital education strategies. This study presents a comparative empirical analysis of OER ecosystems in India, developed countries (including the United States, United Kingdom, and Canada), and other developing nations. Drawing on adoption statistics, policy documentation, infrastructure data, cost-savings research, and learning outcomes studies, the paper positions India as a hybrid model—characterised by strong centralised policy leadership and large-scale implementation, yet constrained by infrastructural inequities and uneven institutional integration. Developed countries demonstrate institutional maturity, diversified funding mechanisms, and robust quality assurance systems, while many developing countries rely on donor-supported, project-based initiatives. The study concludes with policy recommendations and future research directions aimed at strengthening sustainability, equity, and global collaboration in OER ecosystems.

**Key Words:** Open Educational Resources, Digital Divide, Higher Education Policy, SWAYAM, Educational Equity, Cost Savings, Developing Countries, SDG 4.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Open Educational Resources (OER) are teaching, learning, and research materials that are freely accessible and openly licensed, allowing users to retain, reuse, revise, remix, and redistribute content (UNESCO, 2019). Wiley (2014) conceptualised these permissions as the “5R framework,” forming the theoretical foundation of open education. OER have become central to global education reform efforts, particularly in advancing Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4), which emphasizes inclusive and equitable quality education.

Since the early 2000s, OER has evolved from institution-based experiments to globally recognised policy instruments. More than 69 countries have integrated OER into national strategies, and over 45 countries have formal OER policy frameworks (UNESCO, 2019). However, implementation varies significantly across economic contexts. This paper compares OER ecosystems in developed countries, India, and other developing nations using empirical data and policy analysis.

### Theoretical and Policy Framework

The UNESCO (2019) Recommendation on OER identifies five strategic action areas:

1. Capacity building
2. Supportive policy development
3. Inclusive access
4. Sustainability models
5. International cooperation

These dimensions guide the comparative framework used in this study.

Wiley (2014) argues that the defining feature of OER is not simply free access but legal adaptability, which enables contextualisation across linguistic and cultural environments.

### OER in Developed Countries

#### Institutional Foundations

The modern OER movement gained momentum with the launch of MIT Open Course Ware in 2001 (Massachusetts Institute of Technology, n.d.). By 2023, the initiative had published materials from more than 2,500 courses and attracted hundreds

Similarly, OpenStax (Rice University, n.d.) provides peer-reviewed open textbooks used by millions of students. Cost-savings analyses indicate that OER adoption has saved students over \$1.7 billion annually in the United States alone (SPARC, 2022).

### Learning Outcomes and Cost Savings

A meta-analysis by Hilton (2016) found no significant difference in learning outcomes between students using OER and those using traditional textbooks. In several cases, OER use correlated with improved course completion rates and increased access for low-income students.

### Infrastructure and Sustainability

Developed countries benefit from broadband penetration exceeding 85–90%, institutional mandates, philanthropic funding (e.g., foundation grants), and embedded quality assurance systems. These elements contribute to long-term sustainability.

### OER in the Indian Context

#### Policy Environment

India's OER ecosystem is largely government-led. The SWAYAM platform (Government of India, 2017) integrates MOOCs into formal higher education credit structures. As of recent reporting, SWAYAM has registered over 1.2 crore unique learners and more than 4 crore enrollments.

The National Education Policy (2020) further emphasises digital learning expansion and open resource development.

#### Infrastructure and Digital Divide

India's internet penetration has reached approximately 50%, yet rural access remains uneven (Telecom Regulatory Authority of India, 2023). Device access disparities and gender-based access gaps persist.

#### Faculty Participation

ROER4D research suggests that approximately 39% of surveyed Indian educators have created or adapted OER (Arinto et al., 2017). However, institutional incentives remain inconsistent.

#### Multilingual Imperative

India recognises 22 scheduled languages. Unlike many developed countries, India must localise OER across multiple linguistic communities, increasing production complexity but enhancing inclusivity.

### OER in Other Developing Countries

In Sub-Saharan Africa and Southeast Asia, OER initiatives are often donor-supported and project-based. Infrastructure constraints—particularly internet penetration below 40% in some regions—limit scalability (Arinto et al., 2017).

However, grassroots innovation is strong, with educators adapting global OER to local contexts despite limited funding.

### Comparative Empirical Analysis

Indicator	Developed Countries	India	Other Developing Countries
Internet Penetration	90–99%	~70%	50–60%
Institutional Mandates	Strong	Moderate	Limited
Measured Cost Savings	\$1.7B+ annually	Limited data	Minimal data
Faculty OER Creation	High with incentives	~39% surveyed	Lower overall
Funding Model	Mixed	Government-led	Donor-dependent
Multilingual Demands	Low	High	Moderate

## II. DISCUSSION

Developed countries demonstrate institutional maturity and diversified funding models. India occupies a hybrid position—strong policy leadership and scale, yet infrastructural inequities and variable institutional embedding. Other developing nations rely heavily on external funding but demonstrate innovative adaptation.

### Policy Recommendations

1. Expand broadband equity in India and developing regions.
2. Incentivise faculty OER creation through grants and recognition.

3. Develop multilingual open repositories.
4. Strengthen international collaboration networks.

### **Future Research Directions**

#### **Future studies should focus on:**

- Longitudinal learning outcome comparisons
- Gender-based digital access disparities
- AI-assisted OER translation systems
- Sustainable funding models
- Cross-national impact metrics

### **REFERENCES**

1. Arinto, P. B., Hodgkinson-Williams, C., King, T., Cartmill, T., & Willmers, M. (2017). Research on Open Educational Resources for Development (ROER4D). <https://www.roer4d.org/>
2. Government of India. (2017). SWAYAM: Study Webs of Active Learning for Young Aspiring Minds. <https://swayam.gov.in/>
3. Hilton, J. (2016). Open educational resources and college textbook choices. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 64(4), 573–590. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-016-9434-9>
4. Massachusetts Institute of Technology. (n.d.). MIT OpenCourseWare. <https://ocw.mit.edu/>
5. Rice University. (n.d.). OpenStax. <https://openstax.org/>
6. SPARC. (2022). OER impact report. <https://sparcopen.org/>
7. Telecom Regulatory Authority of India. (2023). Annual report 2022–2023. <https://www.trai.gov.in/>
8. UNESCO. (2019). Recommendation on Open Educational Resources (OER). <https://www.unesco.org/en/legal-affairs/recommendation-open-educational-resources-oer>
9. Wiley, D. (2014). The access compromise and the 5th R. <https://opencontent.org/blog/archives/3221>