

## OPEN EDUCATION: CONCEPTUAL SYNOPSIS AND DIMENSIONS/SCOPES TOWARDS EFFECTIVE DIGITAL CITIZENSHIP DEVELOPMENT

**Samuel Olayinka IDOWU**

Department of Sociological Studies Education,  
College of Management and Social Sciences Education  
Lagos State University of Education, Lagos State  
idnoblelaw@yahoo.com

### **Abstract**

Effective Digital Citizenship Development is a relatively distinct innovative citizenship insight in the current civic account. It evolves out of necessity to review further citizenship relevance in the globally connected information and communication technology to transform learners' citizenship behaviours within the sociopolitical digital age. There is a need to have an update on learners' citizenship outlook based on the open education concept. Open education is discussed from the term 'open' which is ubiquitous but specifically discussed in the educational context. Thus, extant advocacy on the 'open education' concept has diverse definitions which though related yet contested. As a multivalent and conflated concept, open education has diverse conceptual meanings, constituents/components and values/benefits in socio-civic education which is herein discussed. The conceptualizations have evolved ambiguity, restricting joint efforts, subsiding open innovation thwarting research efforts. Though, there are numerous open education constituents/components but restricted to open education practice, resources, content, and pedagogy to develop effective digital citizenship using diverse available literature for review. Also, identified open education constituents are discussed based on several conceptualizations via literature appraisal involving merging several kinds of literature. It boosts communication and offers an avenue for socio-civic stakeholders' awareness of the concepts' definitions and distinct traits as more functional resource tools in the socio-civic education curriculum implementation (teaching/learning) toward developing effective digital citizenship.

**Keywords:** Open Education, Open Education Practice, Open Education Resources, Open Pedagogy Effective Digital Citizenship Development.

### **Introduction**

This article first explains the word 'digital' as an expressive adjective as it applies to 'citizenship' concept being a term used, virtually, in all areas of extant sociopolitical setting; hence justifying the import and essence of applying it expressly in relation to citizenship. Though a concept applicable in solely digital setting, yet it could adapt to cover prior subjects like citizenship which exist before writing; thus, digital citizenship referring to membership activities in the strict sense of diverse digital participation through socio-civic education.

However, there is consensus that technology involving digital media tools has the tendency to evolve radical transformation in young learners' sociopolitical and civic engagement in the broader society. Civic scholars have clearly realized and pursued the potentials of technology by harnessing the capacity to integrate online activities into socio-civic curriculum implementation. Socio-civic education underpins constructing essential knowledge, developing dispositions, and acquiring skills for through technological tools civic teaching and learning engagement. It underlines using digital technology for knowledge, skills, and dispositions required for effective citizenship development.

Also, this paper argues that citizenship as a contested concept entails nation state-based membership with civil, political, and social privileges, rights, and freedoms. However, these Citizenship forms are persistently underpinned by digital technologies as avenues by which Political class in governance interact to provide and receive information

from citizens. Thus, digital citizenship is a concept having major import in mediating sociopolitical interaction, mentoring, and informal learning to acquire intellectual and participatory skills which enhance effective citizenship through engaging in online applying the open education components.

Prior to discussing 'open education' concept, like 'digital' above, I discuss the word 'open' which is not novel in higher education teaching and learning and I argue that it emanates from the educational writing as early as the late 1940's. Since its initial mention, diverse educational concepts have been greatly applied to 'open' as constituents/components of open education discussed in this paper and these include, open educational practices, open educational resources, and open pedagogy,

These concepts are principles relevant to socio-civic education despite having distinct thoughts; however, the paper is interested in using the concepts 'digital citizenship' and open education in relation to socio-civic roles having major imports on learners and educational institutions as citizenship stakeholders. Undoubtedly, digital technologies have reached virtually all aspect of sociopolitical, civic, and personal setting. However, the limits among these concepts are not stricto sensu clear, yet this paper discusses the concepts distinctively to examine their relevance as normative constructs to boost and act as intervention in socio-civic education.

As stated above, this paper first conceptualizes the words 'digital' and 'open' in relation to educational teaching/learning contexts. Then it discusses effective digital citizenship from a socio-civic education views as well examines open education, its constituent concepts, values, challenges, and capacity building to initiate effective digital citizenship development through socio-civic education curriculum implementation. Digital citizenship is an arena for mobilizing normative action and intervention towards digital literacy as retort to learners' broad citizenship need in normal life. Thus, I discuss these issues as socio-civic educator concerned and induced about how open education conceptualizations, constituents (components) and use can be learning tools to construct knowledge about digital citizenship and develop appropriate social norms to make learners more constructive as hallmark of evolving effective digital citizenship

### **Socio-civic Education and Effective Digital Citizenship**

Socio-civic Education is social studies and civic education merging with the task to develop effective citizenship in young learners by developing civic competences involving civic knowledge, dispositions (values, and attitudes), and skills (intellectual and participatory) via digital technological tools to engage in civic teaching and learning. The term socio-civic education is used as the efforts to train learners to engage in citizenship (civic and political) activity based on best practices. However, the terms civic and political varied as civic engagement entails efforts to foster public good via non-governmental groups engaging in informal community work and political engagement is the efforts to influence the state. A broad-based effective citizenship depicts learners are not voting spectators, but active participants ready and willing to express views and work within society context as required (Bowyer & Kahne, 2020; Gould et al., 2011; Zukin, Keeter, Andolina, Jenkins, & Delli Carpini, 2006; Barber, 2003; Dewey, 1927).

Thus socio-civic education vital goal is preparing learners for effective citizenship realizing that "citizenship culture is not via genetic pool, but by curriculum (teaching/learning) implementation to each generation of learners afresh (Sandra Day O'Connor). The current socio-civic education state of affairs in respect to effective citizenship has the capacity and mandate to ensure learners are trained to have voice and influence. In so doing, it needs set of curricular practices covering service learning, open classroom climate dialog on extant civic activities, extracurricular activities and government processes simulations to foster civic engagement (Gould, Jamieson, Levine, McConnell, & Smith, 2011; Campbell, 2008; Kahne & Sporte, 2008).

The general consensus in socio-civic circle is that technology involving tools has the tendency to evolve radical transformation in young learners' sociopolitical and civic commitment in the broader culture. It is clear that realizing technology potentials makes it expedient to harness and integrate online activities into socio-civic curriculum implementation. Digital technologies have great ability to equip intellectual and participatory skills in learners to boosts effective citizenship practice and socio-civic experts have attested to technologies values in developing effective digital citizenship using internet to read, edit and retrieve information hitherto remote or entail vast effort to attain; develop, individually and collectively about civic engagement; impart ideas (views) with a possibly huge audience; offer and obtain reaction from classmates, whatever the physical location, age, or social locus and swap ideas directly with other learners short of institutional gatekeepers (Komalasari, & Anggraini, 2019; Westheimer, 2018)

Based on the above, opportunity for learners' digital engagement is currently inserted in socio-civic learning to boost citizenship transformation. Such digital engagement integrated into civic and political practice has digitally fixated socio-civic learning to adopt, inter alia, online civic engagement which has fairly spread among diverse groups. Socio-civic digital practices is a vital tool adopted in the present day Nigerian formal and informal settings to establish various groups for citizens' mobilization, advocacy and awareness on the rule of law, against injustice, create checks and balances considering the political class excesses; agitate for citizens' socioeconomic (claims) rights; applying pressure on government and exchanging views, among others. This often occurs through online social media practices and platforms like YouTube and Pinterest as well other digital engagement forms crucial to sociopolitical and civic (Robb, 2017; Allen & Light, 2015; Bennett & Segerberg, 2012; Cohen, Kahne, Bowyer, Middaugh, & Rogowski, 2012). Thus, it is imperative for socio-civic scholars to offer conceptual perspectives of effective digital citizenship in relation to open education and its various dimensions/scopes and in doing this; it is pertinent to discuss next effective digital citizenship.

### **Digital and Digitalization**

The words 'digital' and digitalization in relation to 'citizenship' concept are unnecessary description as it often seems imprecise. These terms are more often openly applied across disciplines including socio-civic dialogue to qualify/describe concept like citizenship, which in most stances are distorted and ambiguous. Despite this, these terms are very relevant in virtually all disciplines in the modern sociopolitical and civic contexts thus justifying its continual import and potent application to qualify/describe citizenship concept. In this context, the words are embraced to expound, amend, narrow, or qualify broad citizenship concept to have normative effect entailing adopting putative digital citizenship behavioural value transformation.

Both 'digital' and digitalization depicts citizenship developmental transformation fixed in legal, sociopolitical, and civic norms and practices. When the modifiers 'digital' and digitalization are added to citizenship, there is an implicit major transformation in the magnitude of citizenship practices (Kitchin, 2014). Thus, innate to evolve reforms and insight in digital citizenship is the principles of control assess and ensures proximity of information. Also, these words convey sociopolitical and civic values, rules, and beliefs to make citizenship digital; hence advocating that governance, authority and accountability values differs. This is due to the innovative facets which both words have brought into citizenship with distinct set of practices from the orthodox vote casting duty or civil society participation in online debate input. Also, these words infer a diverse narrow citizenship ideal but seems more dialectally true to discourse citizenship in relation to digital era, in line with relevant basic ethical value practices created by digital and digitalization in the sociopolitical and civic order.

Relatively, few articles extricate the terms digital, digitalization, digitization, and digitation, all of which are applied vaguely in the literature, and this seems to have mix-up the terms' application. Literature argues that digital and digitalization seems vague in offering strict meaning of the terms due to its obscurity. But both terms have to do with technological dynamics. A simple meaning of digital entails technologies to create information and communication. This technology acquires information and breaks it down into its minutest mechanisms by transforming analogue signal into discrete pieces. Digital entails the action or process of digitizing via converting analogue data in later use images, video, and text) into digital form. It is the transformation of existing socio-civic curriculum implementation yet aided by non-digital artifacts or integrated into a whole as newly fixed digital skill. Digital is to integrate analogue with new technologies to boost learners' and teachers' interactions in the teaching/learning process via digitalization (Gobble, 2018; Clerck, 2017 Parviainen et al. 2017).

Digitalization refers to the use of digital technology, and probably digitized information to create and harvest value in new ways. Digitalization is the growing ICT application across the school system about a range of digital technologies, concepts and trends like artificial intelligence, Internet of Things (IoT) and the Fourth Industrial Revolution. Thus, digitalization is about sociopolitical and civic reform involving digital communication and media frames. It involves applying digital technologies improve socio-civic curriculum implementation; replace and convert prior orthodox physical (face to face) classroom teaching and learning process to create a milieu for digital classroom in which digital information is at the core to initiate the harvest value. It makes manipulation and transformation of information, text, graphics, audio, and video in ways never thought as possible. Moreover, literature depict digitalization as the prodigy of intelligent linked machines that information and digital technologies power. It is not the incursion or invasion of a novel reform, but continual interaction of digital innovations in the whole socio-civic instructional delivery is for creative and innovative interaction among classroom stakeholders through channels. Digital and digitalization are the consequential impact innovations processes and roles of information and communication technology on socio-civic

curriculum learning systems towards sociopolitical, cultural, and economic transformation and creating new citizenship view in the socio-civic discourse. This digitalization has changed the interaction between the state and citizens in a bond theorized as citizenship. To capture this citizenship transformation, lead to the novel concept of digital citizenship (Crittenden et al., 2019; Srai & Lorentz, 2019; Ringenson et al., 2018; Morley et al., 2018; IEA, 2017).

### **Citizenship Concept**

Generally, citizenship as a contested concept has been in existence years ago and it is an explicit political philosophy which is traditionally theorized as the bond between citizens and the state; so, membership is defined by the package of citizens' rights and duties (Turner, 1993). Literatures over citizenship development, inter alia, is based on Thomas Humphrey Marshall naming three citizenship dimensions as civil, political, and social elements. The civil dimension entails individual rights, like freedom of speech, thought and faith; right to own property; and the right to justice. Also, political aspect provides opportunity to vote and be voted for, exercise power via participating in country's political governance processes. The social part pertains to state's economic, welfare, security, and socio-civic culture. The citizenship concept is more expounded by other global elements such as identity and culture. Above citizenship description is based on 'dutiful citizenship' notions, which entails being informed about issues through the mass media and obliged to partake in electoral practices. Individual interests are expressed via political parties and interest groups membership.

This traditional citizenship view has been critiqued by feminists and diverse advocates for its narrow trend in identity, expression, and participation. But recently, innovative citizenship norms are emerging involving 'personalized life politics' in which effective citizenship engagement is based on choice, consumption, and socio-civic actions whereby citizenship relies on training learners to be amply prepared and equipped by formal and informal (civil) institutions on global and/or national issues includes the electoral processes. The modern citizenship concept embraces digital transformative impact called digital citizenship discussed below (Jæger, 2021; Schou, 2018; Bennett, 2007; Turner, 1993; Marshall, 1992/1950).

### **Effective Digital Citizenship**

Recent citizenship norms are continually supported by digital technologies as ways for political officeholders interact to provide and receive information from citizens. Ontologically, citizenship depicts the bond between the citizens and states, community, or social platform and the self-responsibilization socio-civic (duties) as the innovation and creativity of effective citizenship. It denotes technology import and effects on citizenship perceptions communicated among learners' during socio-civic curriculum resulting in shift toward digital citizenship.

Digital citizenship is an emerging concept with major import in mediating socio-civic and political engagements as effective citizenship trait via effective formal and informal online learning interaction to acquire intellectual and participatory skills. Digital citizenship debate emanated from the initial tag of digital divide raising the issue of membership inclusiveness and/or exclusiveness from the information technology world. Since digitalization concept is a constructive innovation, then inclusiveness in digital world is valuable; so, exclusion from the information technology is not only a deficit but a source of inequity. In view of the rejection of inequity and exclusion which pervasively created by digital divide; the need to transform and adopt the digital citizenship concept became expedient marking inclusion process to digital technology global membership (McCosker et al., 2016; Mossberger, K. 2008; Norris, 2001)

Digital citizenship definitions while complementary in many respects may also differ due to citizenship perception itself differs in historically associated rights and duties of living in a country. In the present digital era, citizenship entails both offline and online real life (RL) and immersive reality (IR) engagement. Citizenship requires convergence between physical and virtual participation, however, in the current dispensation, effective citizenship involves digital competence. It infers being a digital citizen, involving educational institution portals, social media network platforms and other online engagements in which learners perform diverse functions and roles. It is the current citizenship drift of nation states engaging learners in innovative sociopolitical and civic reforms activities. Learners acquire skills to engage in multifaceted digitally enhanced learning, among other sources, via open education involving internet based activities. Embedded in digital citizenship is creativity and innovation capacity to adopt variety of technological (digital) tools. Digital Citizenship is the value extent of learner's interaction based on knowledge and understanding of applicable norms and ethics, disposition and membership standards, duties and behaviour on technology utilization in cyberspace, involving social networks as well as school setting. Digital citizenship is the regular means of access

to engaging in internet technology based on didactic and technical skills to perform tasks of exploring, discovering, and applying information on the web to communicate with others; thus, a potent source of empowering and equipping learners to engage in socio-civic citizenship practices. This makes digital citizenship definition as an approach, which requires open access right to the internet which can be applied to grasp online citizenship engagement (Jørring, Valentim & Porten-Cheé, 2019; McGillivray, et al., 2016; Impero 2016; Mossberger, 2008).

Effective digital citizenship entails digital literacy opportunities in terms of physical accessibility to computer and network, content, and intellectual accessibility. The literacy view is the intellectual accessibility in knowledge and skills for effective participation as digital citizens. Thus, digital literacy perspective of effective digital citizenship is based on acquiring diverse intellectual and participatory skills involving knowledge construct, impart and assess digital information as well as practice diverse technologies effectively to obtain, construe and judge information quality. Also, effective digital citizenship development offer insight on the extant nexus between technology, life-long learning, personal privacy, information stewardship, among others and apply apt technology skills to connect and effectively participate and contribute with peers, colleagues into socio-civic activities as vibrant, informed, and engaged learners.

It concerns functional information diffusion in the digital era on daily civic activities using internet and this involves content appraisal, from hypertext (link to website, facebook links to facebook page) to context, searching virtual library, knowledge assembly among others. However, the important issue in digital citizenship is that learners become active information receivers in the interacted digital information discovery, valuation and diffusion in the new milieu. Also, it entails insight into framework for exploring vital technological skills as well as legal and ethical values to perform socio-civic duty towards effective function (Eshet-Alkalai, 2004; Gilster, 1997).

Effective digital citizenship is, simpler, 'learners' participatory right to engage in online socio-civic and political activities exploiting the rise of internet opportunities. Thus, effective digital citizenship entails bridging the digital divide by ensuring the prioritizing rights to free and open access, inclusion, and communication. These rights are exercised through social media platforms such as Facebook and Twitter becoming tools for socio-civic and political engagement. The digital citizenship context involves sequence of duties or activities involving construing various streams of national and global information, news feeds or creating digital identities which ultimately evolve digital citizens (Isin & Ruppert, 2015; Mossberger, Tolbert, & Mcneal, 2007; Shelley et al., 2004; Thrane, Shelley, Shulman, Beisser, & Larson, 2004).

Digital citizenship is about theorizing; reforming and redefining technology to evolve and embrace transformative civic behaviours attainable via open education's access to digital space in socio-civic and political engagements. But the difficulty in digital frames is the obstinate growing belief in algorithmic decision-making raises critical issues of how learners acquire skills to become informed, participatory and effective digital citizen who are self-reliant in articulating views on citizenship issues against the (nation state) government. Evidently, initiating and boosting digital technologies in our educational system via relevant government legislation on its application/practice to help governments assert discipline (control) over its use for public security (Ozalp, 2019; Jenkins, Shresthova, & Gamber-Thompson, 2016; Sarre, 2015).

I submit from the above that digital citizenship is a potent inclusive empowerment for socio-civic, political, cultural and civil engagements if learners are amply equipped and prepared to fuse into digital knowledge, dispositions and skills via open education in its diverse constituents to evolve effective, connected lifelong learner. Thus, digital citizenship integrates effectiveness on engagement and duty as well as impacting prospect towards a better world. This concept is a vital issue involving digital engagement resulting from digital technology skill and practice. It is about constructive assertion to engage in digital technology via practice involving interacting with others, create and utilize digital content as effective digital citizenship mark (eTwinning 2016; Netsafe 2016; Australian Government n.d).

Unfortunately, attaining effective digital citizenship requires educational resources like textbooks with high costs of accessibility and affordability at the higher (post-secondary) education. Conventional educational practices, resources and even pedagogy are seen as obstacles to socio-civic educational curriculum innovative goal of developing effective digital citizenship in learners. Moreover, there is literature deficit on open education and its constituent dimensions involving its practice, resources, pedagogy, among others, in socio-civic education curriculum implementation to develop learners' digital citizenship. The viable option to the identified deficit issue above entails open and free online access to practices, resources- textbooks; pedagogic activities which can be revised for better socio-civic curriculum

implementation for the goal of developing effective digital Citizenship in learners. Thus, obliging the need to offer open education conceptual Synopsis and dimensions (/scopes).

### **Open Education**

Conceptually, the word 'open' as with any word has various usages with more broad and narrow insights. Broadly, open infers flexibility, freedom/right, receptive, and relative to closed; also, refers to lacking harm to any right/claim, not subject to, free and unrestrained. Openness differs in magnitudes, forms, goals, and effects required in open education. However, there are issues which are common across the various open education facets, and these include capacity to nurture personal action, self-determination, and self-regulated lifelong learning. In doing so, education right which is a major requisite to open education develop digital citizenship.

Open education is viewed as the curriculum implementation via applying digital technologies intended to obliterate obstacles to learning accessibility adaptable for learners' engagement. Though, ab initio, the word 'open' is ubiquitous but in this paper, it is explicitly explored from the socio-civic education curriculum (teaching/learning) implementation context. Thus, extant advocacy on open education concept involves multivalent and conflated meanings due to its diverse related and hitherto disputed nature.

It is worth remembering that 'open' in 'open education' does not apply just to content, data, or resources, but part of wider change and movement towards equality in collaboration.

Historically, 'open' as an educational learning idea is not innovative; but has been traced by scholars to late 1940's and others saw its insertion into the educational dialect to between 1960's and 1970's and by this time its initial usage in the education context has grown greatly.

Scholars' consensus ad idem is that openness is an obscure, transformative and ambiguous conceptualization with broad oversight authorizing flexibility as it perpetually grows to evade noted conflicting postures causing lack of clear definitions. It is applied in the open education contexts with its various dimensions (scopes) involving open education practice, open educational resources, open content, open pedagogy, among others, which this paper discusses (DeVries, 2019; Cronin & MacLaren, 2018; Baker, 2017; Bologna Open Recognition Declaration, 2016; Lane, 2009).

In this paper context, openness in Education refers more to flexibility in terms of free access and choice of high-quality curriculum content, resources, tools, and practices free of legal, financial, and technical obstacles which can be fully utilized, shared and adapted in the digital milieu. Open education concept is based on Article 26 of The United Nations (U.N.) Universal Declaration of Human Rights which states that "Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free". Open education stakeholders cover educational resource initiators (authors), educators (teachers, advisors, facilitators) among others (Economides & Perifanou, 2018; Deepwell, et al., 2017; Mulder & Janssen, 2013).

From the above, open education jointly apply to several socio-civic curriculum engagements to eliminate obstructions so as to make socio-civic content and data freely and legally available for learners and educators continuously so as to evolve transformations like engaging in open socio-civic pedagogic practices to eliminate prior customary socio-civic teachers-learners roles and conversely initiate mentor/learners interactions (Poulter, 2014).

Also, it is the digital technology in curriculum instruction to broaden learning practices as a right, accessible, abundant and customized for learners. This offers several teaching/learning methods to input knowledge constructed; while giving range of access means to formal and non-formal instructions to connect with. Such practices entail having open access to published research works in open journals; open data release for further usage by others; open pedagogic (teaching) practice for learners to engage in their assignments to boost participation; open scholarship input into teaching and research practices; and open educational resource inputs and reuse of teaching/learning resources involving access to free courseware and textbooks (Opening up Education: A Support Framework for Higher Education Institutions, 2016)

There is persistent transformation in open education practices as various facets like content licensing; definitions of open, incentives for participation, among others of the term are prone to debates. There are other facets involving technology to boost learning, enhancing data practice for education innovations less polemic among developing countries. Education, holistically, is experiencing reforms in which open education play major role, though it (open education) is ignorantly seen narrowly as involving just education content and resources application. By implication, content is open once it satisfies meaning of Open and stakeholders have free access to practice, use again, and reorder

subject to the obligation to assign and/or share alike. It implies having the right of 'open' license, resources (textbooks, websites, videos, curricula, lesson plans, audio, and image files) are free for sharing and adaptation based on pedagogical needs.

It affords various curriculum (teaching and learning) implementation patterns offering diverse formal and non-formal access for socio-civic knowledge input and construction. It entails global open access to available socio-civic practices, resources, and tools as basis for input to improve learning value. However, open education should not be narrowed to just open educational resources as it draws on open (digital) technologies to mediate joint, elastic socio-civic learning via open input of teaching practices to equip and prepare educators to obtain utmost socio-civic content knowledge, participatory skills, innovative collaborative learning methods and also develop assessment format from other educators (Cape Town Open Education Declaration, 2008; Werth & Williams, 2020). It is an obligation to openness with regards to socio-civic and political education with access to free software and open source to evolve right to knowledge for all learners resulting in effective citizenship development. Embedded in open education are numerous diverse instructional activities subject to various collections of practices, resources and pedagogy utilizing online technology to liberally share knowledge across disciplines.

Open education entails openness in practice, resource, pedagogy, among others, in 'gratis' (free) so that stakeholders should have access without cost including legal rights of reuse, revise, remix and redistribute and, especially resource adaptations. Until recently, within the open education context, core efforts has yet been focused on, open resource access. But, open education extends to open education practices (OEP), open education resource (OER), open pedagogy, among others which are innovations in education practice made possible by open licensing.

### **Open Educational Practice (OEP):**

Open educational practices comprises of open educational resources, open content and pedagogy, among other teaching practices. Also, it describes teaching and learning practices involving course design, assessment and co-creation of resources, open licensing, peer-to-peer learning, and learners' self-directed learning (Paskevicius, 2017; Beetham et al., 2012).

Conceptualizing open educational practices (OEP) emerged recently and broadly differ from those centered on design and application of open educational resources to wider meanings covering, though not certainly fixated on open educational resources. However, since 2007 the vast open educational practice (OEP) conceptualizations embrace various access and openness which include open content. Research literature shows that initial open educational practices (OEP) conceptualization emerged as portion of the Open eLearning Content Observatory Services project (OLCOS, 2006/2007). Open Educational Practices is the core source from which "Open Content", "Open Pedagogy", and "Open Educational System" develops from. Open Pedagogy and Open Educational System are processes by which Open Content is constructed. In another literature version, open educational practices are comprised of OER, open/public pedagogies, open learning, open scholarship, and open teaching practices sharing (Cronin & MacLaren, 2018; Beetham et al., 2012).

Open Educational Practices are teaching trends of using open resources via open technologies to expedite joint flexible learning covering working to fuse post web pedagogy, andragogy and heutagogy (self-determined learning). Open educational practice theorization was initial by the OLCOS project as educational practices involving learners in effective engagement with content and tools during the learning process, and promote learners' self-management, creativity and working in teams. This concept (OEP) stresses learners' activities towards developing intellectual knowledge and participatory skills. It is an innovative learner-centered teaching practices which aid the creation and reuse open resources via institutional policies to evolve innovative pedagogic models to empower learners as co-creators on lifelong learning path (Cronin & MacLaren, 2018; Andrade et al., 2011; Geser, 2007)

Also, embedded in Open Education Practices are open licensing, open research, collaboration, and innovative assessment approaches all of which are built into policy context of open education with extant explanations. This involve the teaching and learning practices of course design, assessment and co-creation of open educational resources (OER), open licensing, peer-to-peer learning, and learners' self-directed learning. Open Educational Practices (OEP) is about global interactions among learners entailing self-directed learning using personal networking to further enhance greatly customary learning milieus. In this concept, socio-civic educators and learners gain copiously from open interaction with experts and diverse partners globally. Embedded in open educational practice are open educational resources derived from open technologies to aid joint, flexible learning and open teaching practices input to equip educators with value-based best practice designs of other socio-civic educators. It is a lasting critical

innovative vision of developing insight into collaborative learning and assessment process leading to certification. (Paskevicius, 2017; Conole, 2011; Cape Town Open Education Declaration, 2007; (Center for Open Learning and Teaching (COLT), University of Mississippi).

Open Educational Practices is the collaborative practices which embrace construction, use, and reuse of open educational resources and pedagogic practices through participatory technologies and socio-civic networks for interaction, peer-learning for socio-civic learners' knowledge construction and liberation. It consist of diverse patterns involving open and public pedagogy, open learning, practicing open scholarship, open sharing of teaching practice, and open technologies use with OER creation, controlling, use and reuse.

This open education practice view shows learning Twitter network engagement, class wiki contribution, or writing and sharing an educational blog post are open practice facets. Thus, Open Education Practices consist of constructing, reusing open education resources as well as other transparency forms about academic practice, like blogging, tweeting, presenting, and debating scholarly and pedagogic activities, in manners which uphold reflection, meditation, revision, and collaboration. Obviously, this reflects broad (expansive) OEPs theorizations which seems inclusive of however not inevitably fixated on OER (Cronin & MacLaren, 2018; Cronin (2017; Havemann, 2016; Beetham et al., 2012)

As a practice, it supports creation and reclaim of open education resources (OER) through institutional policies to stimulate innovative pedagogic patterns intended to empower learners as co-creators of their lifelong learning path. OEP covers more than free and open access to educational resources, thus an collective phrase embracing various dimensions of openness and the core source from which other concepts involving open access, open scholarship, open learning; Open Content, Open Pedagogy and Open Educational System as develops from. Open Pedagogy and Open Educational System are by which Open Content is constructed (Naidu, 2016; Andrade et al., 2011)

### **Open Educational Resource**

Insight on open education alludes to developing more openly available educational resources (materials) for curriculum teaching and learning implemented via online under open license permitting adaptation and/or re-use. This has led to, open educational resources (OER) to become a widely discussed topic in recent years. These are educational materials licensed under an open copyright license like Creative Commons or in the public domain. Whichever way, educators and learners globally, benefit from free access *and* authorization to engage in open education resource (OER) based on the "5R" activities

It is pertinent to conceptualize open education resource to construct better knowledge and insight on learners' effective engagement in relation to digital technology during socio-civic curriculum implementation. Better insight is required to develop socio-civic learners' engagement with open educational resources. The task of engaging open educational resources is a way to evolve innovative learning experiences, reform in teaching methods to engage in collaborative teaching and learning experience to boost socio-civic curriculum implementation. Open education resource is a value action plan for socio-civic classroom learning as input to quality improvement in socio-civic curriculum reform. Open Educational Resource has, probably, the most broadly agreed and accepted conceptualization within the open education concept and as Open Educational Practices major elements; though, this is seen as an exception rather than the rule. It is used as catalyst for pedagogic transformation to evolve profound socio-civic engagement in line with institutional vision and values. There is the need to view its construction and adaptation as learning resources which increasingly demand flexible learning opportunities to build on. Operational open educational resources theorization differs based on the context of its usage to offers shared language valuable to have insight into the concept traits (Cronin & MacLaren, 2018; Ehlers, 2011a; Geser, 2007; Open Educational Quality (OPAL).

I conceptualize Open Educational Resources (OER) as teaching, learning and research materials in diverse forms extant in public domain or released under an open license authorizing free practice and re-purposing. Socio-civic curriculum (teaching, learning, and research) resources fixated and released to the civic domain in line with intellectual property right approving the free use or re-purposing for socio-civic educators and learners. The broadest Open Educational Resources (OER) conceptualization entails materials provided freely and openly for use as teaching and learning development and research adaptation. I argue that these are educational resources open for free use, reuse, adaptation and for basic input by Institutions underlining acknowledging work with open educational resources in promoting the use in research, intellectual and creative works. These are digital teaching, learning and research materials mostly existing free in the socio-civic purview based on open license access (licenses lacking cost) to open, use, adapt and restructure in the absence of any form of limitation or restrictions. It is part of processes engaged by socio-civic educators to expand access to innovative and creative curriculum resources. Better still, open educational



resources are the teaching, learning and research materials that make use of appropriate tools involving open licensing, to permit their free reuse, continuous improvement, and repurposing by others for educational purposes (UNESCO, 2009; Mays, 2017; Ehlers, 2011a; Downes, 2007; <https://hewlett.org/strategy/open-educational-resources/>). (Poulter & Farrow, 2014; Atkin, Brown & Hammond, 2007).

Socio-civic curriculum (teaching/learning and research) implementation materials explicitly created with free license for socio-civic educators and learners to input, modify and possess. The concept explains resources (materials) freely available for socio-civic end users' right to re-mix, mend, and redistribute based on extant authorizations and permits. The intent is to overcome obstacles to having access via best practices in curriculum implementation towards adapting for local sole contexts.

Open educational resources (OER) cover various forms of materials, involving small chunks-LO/LOM to a full textbook or a full course, software/tools. Also, it embraces non-restrictive copyright tools like the Creative Commons, curriculum course materials, lesson plans, quizzes, syllabi, instructional modules, textbooks, research articles, and assessments, simulations, streaming videos, tests, learning content, software tools to develop, use, and distribute content, and implementation resources such as open licenses, and other tools, materials, or techniques used to boost teaching and learning activities for socio-civic knowledge construction and skills access (Poulter & Farrow, 2014; Belawati, 2014).

### **Open Content**

Open Content is majorly rooted in open education and open educational practice conceptualizations; also, the term is synonymous with Open Licensing. The Open Content concept is a term, ab initio, applied by David Wiley around the late 1990s and explained as copyrightable works offered continually free or granted right of access to retain, reuse, revise, remix, and redistribute—refers to as the 5Rs of open. Open licensing is the main device to open content which depicts copyrightable work which is certified in a way which offers socio-civic recipients free and continuous authorization to access by engaging the 5R activities listed above. However, apart from open educational resources other allied open education concepts in the literature are fixed in the open content milieu. In socio-civic (open) education context, Open Content is the curriculum (teaching/learning and research outputs free of access and open to all socio-civic receivers (dos Santos, Punie, CastañoMuñoz, 2016; Wiley, 2014).

Open content is conceptualized as a broad term which embraces a eclectic array of resources (materials) made openly accessible and available on the web; thus inferring open licensing as permitting re-use, revise, remix and re-distribute (the 4Rs). It is not based on its projected practice but requires raw data, materials, learning, teaching, research materials and informational services (McGill, 2013). In fact, open content definition is well confines to liber content and so any free content license would qualify as an open content license (RTI, 2018; Poulter & Farrow, 2014). In the socio-civic context, open content is view as teaching, learning and research materials and outputs which are available due to its cost free for socio-civic educators and learners. It is seen to comprise teaching and learning items as well as scholarly products and efforts involving research materials and outputs as well as data. Open content and open educational resources are identical as both ideas are copyrights elements free in the civic domain with license for socio-civic users to retain, reuse, revise, remix, and reorder free from cost continually (Williams & Werth, 2020; Dos Santos, Punie & Castaño-Muñoz, 2016; Wiley, n.d).

There is a general delusion that creator (source) of open (license) content in the public domain has granted the copyrights of access inherent in the resources. Open licenses development is obliged based on the intent to safeguard copyright holders' entitlements of the digitized content as it is prone to easy copy and possible online (Internet) sharing in the absence of authorization within the settings. Thus, broad legal contexts are inducted to order open content resources licensing praxis mainly to authorize copying the content while other authors offer terms policing content and resources revision and use.

The most commonly known of these licenses is the Creative Commons licensing charter which offers legal tools towards ensuring authors of content materials retain recognition for the work while permitting any form of input, as well pursue commercial activity restriction as an option meant to avert unauthorized revision. Thus, author applies Creative Commons (CC) license regarding the work explicitly to hold copyright over such work, however assents, based on the license to volunteer access to part of the rights ([www.creativecommons.org](http://www.creativecommons.org)).

## **Open Pedagogy**

Open pedagogy concept is synonymous with other terms in the literature, including open teaching; open learning open educator, open digital pedagogy, among others, all of which are considered pedagogical and ab initio emerged during the first trend of open education in the 1960s and 1970s to reflect the socio-civic eclectic mind-set advocating against human rights abuse, decolonization and social justice (Koseoglu & Singh, 2019; Nascimbeni & Burgos, 2016; Couros & Hildenbrandt, 2016; Deimann & Sloep, 2013; Siemens & Matheos, 2010; Lane, 2009). However, the concept re-emergence in the current open education context is to strengthen, support and stabilize open educational practice and resources discussed above. Nevertheless, there is broad disparity in the various extant open pedagogy theorizing makes it intricate to rationalize the concept which possibly leads to claims of open washing echoing other critical issues in socio-civic curriculum (teaching/learning) implementation context.

In exploring degree of openness while accepting the content potential value, open pedagogy is viewed as initiating socio-civic curriculum (teaching and learning) implementation processes aided by Web technologies set to evolve a more transformational role in the collaboration between educators and learners. Also, open pedagogy is defined as the use of open content emphasizing socio-civic learners' connections within and across networks. It is the blending of three core socio-civic praxes entailing participatory digital technologies; evolving open, joint, and interactive praxes; and aiding learners' impacts on open educational resources. Moreover, open pedagogy is theorized as integrating open education resources (OER) into socio-civic curriculum issues to evolve content (depositories) sources as blueprint for collaborative learning and engagement in formal, informal, and non-formal socio-civic classroom learning (Wiley & Hilton, 2018; DeRosa & Robison, 2017; DeRosa & Robison, 2015, 2017; Rosen & Smale, 2015; Hegarty, 2015; Weller, 2014; Hodgkinson-Williams & Gray, 2009).

As stated above, open pedagogy concept includes digitization and digitalization, a version of critical digital pedagogy meant to enhance open education practice. In so doing, it initiates discourse and analyze distinct learning milieu and act as opposition to unequal power relations in formal, informal, and non-formal socio-civic learning for educators and learners. It is argued that open pedagogy is a critical approach of democratizing the processes by which educational materials are created and distributed. This enables (allows) more variety of voices to contribute the experiences of relegated groups to be better heard. Open Pedagogy is access based guaranteeing learner-driven education as a process of developing and using learning tools to empower learners towards constructing civic knowledge (Farrow, 2015; Morris & Stommel, 2014; Stommel, 2014; DeRosa & Jhangiani, n.d).

Overall, some of the above open pedagogy conceptualizations are subset aligning with liberal accounts of open educational practice and resources. In the curriculum context, open pedagogy is a critical method stressing teaching and learning as part of the broader socio-civic education scholarship involving both open educational practice and resources. This has led to major discourse among scholars globally on the link between open pedagogy, open educational practice, and resources. In fact, a vital contest in the debates is whether open education resources are a vital constituent of open pedagogy echoing same developments in open education practice. In the open pedagogy theorization, it is resolutely stated that open education resources-is a focus point viewing open pedagogy as socio-civic set of teaching and learning practices applicable in the context of free access to practically engage in 4R or 5R activities based on authorizations trait of open educational resources. Evidently, open pedagogy conceptualizations align with open education resources which in turn are fixed in open education practice concept stressed as mark of open education research right from the basis. This shows the generic nature of the word open to cover various diverse analyses underpinning open education concept perpetual development (Bali, 2017; Wiley, 2017; Wiley, Bliss & McEwen, 2014; Wiley, 2013).

### **Values (Benefits) of Open Education on Effective Digital Citizenship**

Digital technological innovation has naturally evolved transformative citizenship development; but tools are often initiators instead of guides. Thus, open education is due to dialectical link between digital technology and effective citizenship as digital technologies is an innovation to develop effective citizenship via formal and informal open educational teaching/learning to boost effective citizenship development:

- i. Open education initiatives underline digitalization relevance and then oblige teaching socio-civic learners for effective participation via virtual milieu, critical information content assessment and safe online conduct (Fediy et al., 2021; Collins, 2018; Logan, 2016; Ferrari, 2013).

- ii. Also, open education via digital technology (online) engagement can greatly evolve transformation in communication, knowledge accessibility to further boost effective digital citizenship development.
- iii. Open education can be extensively utilized through digital (technologies) resources in formal (class) and informal (home) as basic requisite to equip learners with communication skills and values of cooperation and responsibility vital for online engagement as mark of (Ranchordas, 2020; Parent & Community Impact, Technology, 2018).
- iv. The notion of effective digital citizenship is essentially share same values with conventional citizenship which included being courtesy and politeness, responsibility, and constructive contributing to socio-civic and political system (). Thus, open education should be used to offer necessary supervision to extant learners dubbed digital natives to apply civic ideals in the digital milieu (Ozturk, 2021; Fingal, 2020; Somyürek, 2019; Impero Software & Digital Citizenship Institute, 2016).
- v. Open Education result in development of learners' citizenship engagement due to applying open educational practice and resources in diverse ways to complement other online socio-civic materials. This entails broadens digital citizenship participation through open resources availability and ease of use for socio-civic education engagement.
- vi. Constructive use of open educational practice and resources are effective method of improving retention, especially critical reflection in learners as evidence of improvement digital citizenship practice
- vii. Open education acts as a bridge to formal education as well as using it to encourage institutions to review policies on digital citizenship

## Conclusion

Having insight into various open education conceptualizations explains the core beliefs and norms in prior scholarly works and extant methods of open education experts. This insight is constructive and beneficial for socio-civic researchers interested in open education and its various dimensions involving open educational practice/resources/content and pedagogy discussed above. It is argued that open education and its constituent's broad conceptualizations depict the intricate, real, and set practices in socio-civic curriculum teaching and learning context which guide the selection and usage of open education to develop effective digital citizenship.

Undeniably, utilizing digital technology as citizenship development tools is the broadly adopted extant norms within and outside the socio-civic and political education milieu. To this extent, stakeholders (institutions and others) need to equip, empower, and prepare educators and learners to develop knowledge, skills, and insight on digital citizenship through open educational practice, resources, content and pedagogy to surmount extant deficit.

It is recommended that such intellectual and participatory skills require open education and digital citizenship inclusion in socio-civic curriculum and follow it up with regular updating via capacity building (continuous professional development) programme. It is pertinent for policy makers to initiate socio-civic curriculum that connects educators and learners with other digital natives globally through integrating digital citizenship into open education engagement as a way of developing our learners to be globally effective digital citizens.

## References

- Agosto , D. E. & Hughes-Hassell, S. (2006). Toward a model of the everyday life information needs of urban teenagers, part 1: Theoretical model. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 57(10):1394–1403. .
- Åkesson, M., Sørensen, C., Eriksson, C. (2018) Ambidexterity under digitalization: a tale of two decades of new media at a Swedish newspaper. *Scand. J. Manag.* 34(3), 276–288

- Allen, D., & Light, J. S. (2015). *From voice to influence: Understanding digital citizenship in a digital age*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- American Library Association (2011). Digital literacy definition, URL <http://connect.ala.org/node/181197>
- Andrade, A., Ehlers, U. D., Caine, A., Carneiro, R., Conole, G., Kairamo, A.-K., & Holmberg, C. (2011). *Beyond OER: Shifting focus to open educational practices [OPAL Report 2011]*. Open Education Quality Initiative. Retrieved from <https://oerknowledgecloud.org/content/beyond-oer-shiftingfocus-open-educational-practice>
- Atkin, D. E., Brown, J. S. & Hammond, A. L. (2007). *A review of the Open Educational Resources (OER) movement: Achievements, challenges, and new opportunities*. Report to The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation (pdf). [http://www.hewlett.org/uploads/files/Hewlett\\_OER\\_report.pdf](http://www.hewlett.org/uploads/files/Hewlett_OER_report.pdf) on 28 July 2012.
- Barber, B. (2003). *Strong democracy: Participatory politics for a new age*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Belawati, T. (2014). Open education, open education resources, and massive open online courses. *International Journal of Continuing Education and Lifelong Learning* Volume 7, Issue 1
- Bennett, W. L., & Segerberg, A. (2012). The logic of connective action. *Information, Communication & Society*, 15(5), 739–768.
- Beetham, H., Falconer, I., McGill, L., & Littlejohn, A. (2012). *Open practices: Briefing paper*. JISC. <https://oersynth.pbworks.com/w/file/fetch/58444186/Open%20Practices%20briefing%20paper.pdf>
- Bethesda Statement on Open Access Publishing. (2003). Definition of Open Access Publication. <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:4725199>.
- Bowyer, B & Kahne, J. (2020). The digital dimensions of civic education: Assessing the effects of learning opportunities. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology* 69
- Brennen, J., Kreiss, D. (2016) Digitalization. In: Bruhn Jensen, K., Craig, R.T., Pooley, J., Rothenbuhler, E.W. (eds.) *The international Encyclopedia of Communication Theory and Philosophy*, pp. 1–11. Wiley, Chichester .
- Butcher, N. (2011, 2015). *A Basic Guide to Open Educational Resources (OER)*. Kanwar, A & Uvalic-Trumbi, S (Ed) UNESCO & Commonwealth of Learning. Available in Open Access under the Attribution-ShareAlike 3.0 IGO (CC-BY-SA 3.0 IGO) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/igo/>).
- Cape Town Open Education Declaration. (2007). Cape Town open education declaration: Unlocking the promise of open educational resources. Retrieved from <http://www.capetowndeclaration.org/read-the-declaration>
- Campbell, D. E. (2008). Voice in the classroom: How an open classroom climate fosters political engagement among adolescents. *Political Behavior*, 30(4), 437–454.
- Clerck, J. (2017) Digitalization, Digital Transformation: The Differences. i-SCOOP
- Cohen, C., Kahne, J., Bowyer, B., Middaugh, E., & Rogowski, J. (2012). Participatory politics: New media and youth political action. <http://ypp.dmlcentral.net/publications/107>.
- Conole, G. (2011, January 7). *Towards Open Educational Practices [blog]*. Retrieved from <http://e4innovation.com/?p=406>
- Crittenden, W., Biel, I., Lovely III, W. (2019). Embracing digitalization: student learning and new technologies. *J. Mark. Educ.* 41(1), 5–14
- Cronin, C., & MacLaren, I. (2018). Conceptualising OEP: A review of theoretical and empirical literature in open educational practices. *Open Praxis*, 10(2), 127–143.
- Dewey, J. (1927). *The public and its problems*. Oxford, England: Holt.

- Economides, A. & Perifanou, M. (2018). The Many Faces of Openness in Education. A paper presented at the 10th International Conference on Education and New Learning Technologies. EDULEARN18 Proceedings, Pgs: 3694-3703.
- Downes, Steven (2007b). Not the Edublog Award Winners. Weblog Post. 2007-12-17. URL: <http://halfanhour.blogspot.com/2007/12/not-edublog-award-winners.html> (2008-01-06).
- Ehlers, U.-D. (2011b). From open educational resources to open educational practices. *Elearning Papers*, 23, pp. 1–8. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ1079969)
- Eling, M., Lehmann, M. (2018). The impact of digitalization on the insurance value chain and the insurability of risks. *Geneva Paper. R. I.-ISS 43(3)*, 359–396.
- Eshet-Alkalai, Y. (2004). Digital literacy: A conceptual framework for survival skills in the digital era. *Journal of Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia*, 13 (1).
- Geser, G., Ed. (2007). *Open educational practices and resources: OLCOS roadmap 2012*. Salzburg, Austria: Salzburg Research & EduMedia Group. Retrieved from [http://www.olcos.org/cms/upload/docs/olcos\\_roadmap.pdf](http://www.olcos.org/cms/upload/docs/olcos_roadmap.pdf)
- Gilster, P. (1997). *Digital literacy*. Wiley Computer.
- Gorenšek, T & Kohont, A (2019). Conceptualization of Digitalization: Opportunities and Challenges for Organizations in the Euro-Mediterranean Area. **Indian Journal of Engineering and Materials Sciences (IJEMS)**, 12 ( 2
- Gobble, M. (2018). Digitalization, digitization, and innovation. *Res. Technol. Manag.* 61(4), 56–59
- Gould, J., Jamieson, K. H., Levine, P., McConnell, T., & Smith, D. B. (Eds.). (2011). *Guardian of democracy: The civic mission of schools*. Philadelphia: Leonore Annenberg Institute for Civics of the Annenberg Public Policy Center at the University of Pennsylvania.
- Hagberg, J., Sundstrom, M., Egels-Zandén, N. (2016). The digitalization of retailing: an exploratory framework. *Int. J. Retail Distrib. Manag.* 44(7), 694–712
- Hansen, D., Shneiderman, B., Smith, M. (2011). *Analyzing Social Media Networks with NodeXL: Insights from a Connected World*. Morgan Kaufmann-Elsevier, Burlington.
- IEA: Digitalization & Energy (2017). <http://www.iea.org/digital/>
- Isin, E., & Ruppert, E. (2015). *Being Digital Citizens*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Jæger, B. (2021). Digital Citizenship - A review of the academic literature. *Public Policy*, 14(1), 24-42. <https://doi.org/10.3224/dms.v14i1.09>
- Jenkins, H., & Carpentier, N. (2013). Theorizing participatory intensities: A conversation about participation and politics. *Convergence*, 19(3), 265–286. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354856513482090>
- Jørring, Louise, Valentim, António & Porten-Cheé, Pablo (2019). Mapping a Changing Field. *A Literature Review on Digital Citizenship. Digital Culture and Society*, 4(2), 11-37.
- Kahne, J. E., & Sporte, S. E. (2008). Developing citizens: The impact of civic learning opportunities on Students' commitment to civic participation. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(3), 738–766. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831208316951>.
- Komalasari, K., & Anggraini, D. N. (2019) Civic Education for Development of Digital Citizenship in the Era of Industrial Revolution 4.0. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, volume 418 2nd Annual Civic Education Conference.
- Koseoglu, S., & Bozkurt, A. (2018). An exploratory literature review on open educational practices. *Distance Education*, 39(4), 441–461. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2018.1520042>

- Lenka, S., Parida, V., Wincent, J. (2017) Digitalization capabilities as enablers of value co-creation in servitizing firms. *Psychol. Market.* 34(1), 92–100
- Lerch, C., Gotsch, M. (2015). Digitalized product-service systems in manufacturing firms: a case study analysis. *Res. Technol. Manag.* 58(5), 45–52
- McCosker, A., Vivienne, S., & Johns, A. (2016). *Negotiating Digital Citizenship*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- McGillivray, D. et al., (2016). “Young people, digital media making and critical digital citizenship,” *Leisure Studies*, 35 (6), pp. 724-738.
- Mossberger, K. Tolbert, C. J. & Anderson, C. (2016.). “The mobile Internet and digital citizenship in AfricanAmerican and Latino communities,” *Information, Communication & Society*, pp. 1-20.
- Mossberger, Karen (2008). Toward digital citizenship. Addressing inequality in the information age. In Chadwick, Andrew & Howard, Philip N.: *Routledge Handbook of Internet Politics* (pp. 173- 185). Hoboken: Taylor and Francis.
- Mossberger, K., Tolbert, C. J., & Mcneal, R. S. (2007). *Digital Citizenship: The Internet, Society and Participation*. The MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/7428.001.0001>.
- Norris, Pipa (2001). *Digital Divide? Civic Engagement, Information Poverty & the Internet in Democratic Societies*. Harvard University Press
- Morley, J., Widdicks, K., Hazas, M. (2018) Digitalization, energy and data demand: the impact of internet traffic on overall and peak electricity consumption. *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.* 38(1), 128–137.
- OECD. (2007). Giving knowledge for free. The emergence of open educational resources. Pdf, retrieved from URL <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/35/7/38654317.pdf>
- Ozalp, S. (2019). Unlawful data access and abuse of metadata for mass persecution of dissidents in Turkey: The by-lock case. In A. Daly, S. K. Devitt, & M. Mann (Eds.), *Good Data* (pp. 117–134). Institute of Network Cultures.
- Pangrazio, L., & Sefton-Green, J. (2021). Digital Rights, Digital Citizenship and Digital Literacy: What's the Difference?. *Journal of New Approaches in Educational Research*, 10(1), 15-27. doi: 10.7821/naer.2021.1.616
- Parida, V., Sjodin, D., Lenka, S., Wincent, J. (2015). Developing global service innovation capabilities: how global manufacturers address the challenges of market heterogeneity. *Res. Technol. Manag.* 58(5), 35–44
- Parviainen, P., Tihinen, M., Kääriäinen, J., Teppola, S. (2017). Tackling the digitalization challenge: how to benefit from digitalization in practice. *IJISPM* 5(1), 63–77.
- Paskevicius, M. (2017). Conceptualizing Open Educational Practices through the Lens of Constructive Alignment. *Open Praxis*, 9(2), 125–140.
- Perez, C. (2015). From long waves to great surges. *Eur. J. Econ. Soc. Syst.* 27(1–2), 69–80
- Poulter, M & Farrow, R (2014). *The Open Education Handbook*. Creative Commons license; CC-BY license. Open Knowledge, CC-BY-SA 3.0 license and the GNU Free Documentation License.
- Reis, J., Amorim, M., Melão, N., Matos, P. (2018). Digital transformation: a literature review and guidelines for future research. In: Rocha, Á., Adeli, H., Reis, L.P., Costanzo, S. (eds.) *Trends and Advances in Information Systems and Technologies: WorldCIST 2018*. AICS, vol. 745, pp. 411–421. Springer, Cham
- Ringenson, T., Höjer, M., Kramers, A., Viggedal, A. (2018) Digitalization and environmental aims in municipalities. *Sustainability* 10(4), 1278-1–1278-16.
- Robb, M. B. (2017). *News and America’s kids: How young people perceive and are impacted by the news*. San Francisco, CA: Common Sense.
- RTI (2018). *Concept Paper on Open Licensing for Ministries of Education in Low and Middle-Income Countries*
- Sarre, R. (2015). Metadata retention: A review of policy implications for Australians. *Justice and Social Democracy Conference*.

- Shelley, M., Thrane, L., Shulman, S., Lang, E., Beisser, S., Larson, T., & Mutiti, J. (2004). Digital citizenship: Parameters of the digital divide. *Social Science Computer Review*, 22(2), 256–269. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439303262580>
- Srai, J., Lorentz, H. (2019) Developing design principles for the digitalization of purchasing and supply management. *J. Purch. Supply Manag.* 25(1), 78–98
- Thrane, L., Shelley, M., Shulman, S., Beisser, S., & Larson, T. (2004). E-political empowerment: Age effects or attitudinal barriers. *Journal of E-Government*, 1(4), 21–37. [https://doi.org/10.1300/J399v01n04\\_03](https://doi.org/10.1300/J399v01n04_03)
- Thorseng, A., Grisot, M. (2017) Digitalization as institutional work: a case of designing a tool for changing diabetes care. *Inform. Technol. People* 30(1), 227–243.
- UNESCO, (2009). Open educational resources. *Conversations in cyberspace*.
- Valenduc, G., Vendramin, P. (2017). Digitalization, between disruption and evolution. *Transf.: Eur. Rev. Labour Res.* 23(2), 121–134.
- Walz, A., & Bekbalaeva, J. (2018). Assessing the potential toward open educational practices in 615 Kyrgyzstan. *Open Praxis*, 10(2), 159–177.
- Westheimer, J (2018). Democratic goals for civic education in the digital age, EdCan Network. Canada
- Williams, K & Werth, E (2020). Visualizing open education: A conceptual aid: AERA Open
- Zukin, C., Keeter, S., Andolina, M., Jenkins, K., & Delli Carpini, M. X. (2006). *A new engagement? Political participation, civic life, and the changing American citizen*. New York: Oxford University Press.