

The Use of Lecture Recordings in Higher Education: A Review of Institutional, Student, and Lecturer Issues

Frances V. O'Callaghan, David L. Neumann, Liz Jones, & Peter A. Creed

School of Applied Psychology, Griffith University
and Menzies Health Institute Queensland

Address:

School of Applied Psychology,
Griffith University,
Gold Coast, Queensland, Australia, 4222

Corresponding author:

A/Prof Frances O'Callaghan

E-mail: f.ocallaghan@griffith.edu.au

Phone: 61 7 56788606

Fax: 61 7 56788291

The Use of Lecture Recordings in Higher Education: A Review of Institutional, Student, and Lecturer Issues

Abstract Web-based lecture technologies are being used increasingly in higher education. One widely-used method is the recording of lectures delivered during face-to-face teaching of on-campus courses. The recordings are subsequently made available to students on-line and have been variously referred to as lecture capture, video podcasts, and Lectopia. We examined the literature on lecture recordings for on-campus courses from the perspective of students, lecturers, and the institution. Literature was drawn from major international electronic databases of Elsevier ScienceDirect, PsycInfo, SAGE Journals, SpringerLink, ERIC and Google Scholar. Searches were conducted using key terms of lecture capture, podcasts, vodcasts, video podcasts, video streaming, screencast, webcasts, and online video. The reference sections of each article were also searched and a citation search was conducted. Institutions receive pressure from a range of sources to implement web-based technologies, including from students and financial imperatives, but the selection of appropriate technologies must reflect the vision the institution holds. Students are positive about the availability of lecture recordings. They make significant use of the recordings, and the recordings have some demonstrated benefits to student learning outcomes. Lecturers recognise the benefits of lecture recordings for students and themselves, but also perceive several potential disadvantages, such as its negative effect on attendance and engagement, and restricting the style and structure of lectures. It is concluded that the positives of lecture recordings outweigh the negatives and its continued use in higher education is recommended. However, further research is needed to evaluate lecture recordings in different contexts and to develop approaches that enhance its effectiveness.

Keywords: lecture recordings, lecture capture; podcasts; learning outcomes; attendance; engagement.

1 Introduction

Universities are under increased pressure to introduce web-based learning technologies (WBLT). The purpose of this review is to examine the use of a form of WBLT: the recording of lectures that are given during face-to-face teaching of on-campus courses. The recordings, which are subsequently made available to students on-line, have been referred to variously as lecture capture, video podcasts, and Lectopia. The present review examines this technology from the perspectives of the students and lecturers within the broader context of the tertiary institutions. Given that students are the 'clients', lecturers are the service providers, and the context is the tertiary institution itself, these groups/concepts provided a useful framework within which to structure the review. We begin by defining key terms and then address the following questions:

- 1) What are the factors influencing universities to implement web-based learning technologies?
- 2) What are the organisational implications of the move towards web-based learning technologies?
- 3) How do students perceive and use lecture recordings?
- 4) What are the effects on class attendance and academic performance?
- 5) How do lecturers perceive and use lecture recordings?
- 6) What practical and research issues need to be addressed in further research?

To conduct the review, we searched the literature in the following major international electronic databases: Elsevier ScienceDirect, PsycInfo, SAGE Journals, SpringerLink, ERIC, and Google Scholar. Searches were conducted using key terms, including lecture recordings, lecture capture (technology), lectopia, podcasts, vodcasts, video podcasts, video streaming, screencast, webcasts, online video, and their combinations with terms such as higher education, learning, and engagement. We particularly focused on the situation in Australia but also considered the wider literature. The reference list for each identified item was also examined to locate additional sources. This was followed by a citation search of the identified material to find further relevant literature. This review focuses on lecture recordings that are used concurrently with face-to-face teaching. Research using lecture recording technologies in place of face-to-face teaching, as in distance education or on-line learning, was not included in the review (except when contrasted to recordings of lectures for on campus students). Such applications are regarded as qualitatively different to lecture recordings that are used to supplement face-to-face teaching, as they are pre-recorded and are used for different purposes.

1.1 Definitions of web-based lecture technologies

Given the wide range of lecture recordings in use, it is important to define the key characteristics of the technology and differentiate this approach from related WBLT approaches. Broadly, *lecture recordings* are technologies involving audio only, or audio combined with video or other media such as PowerPoint slides and document camera images. A widely used lecture recording system is Echo360 (formerly known as Lectopia or iLecture), which can provide both audio and video presentations, although it is more commonly used without the video component due to the cost involved in equipping classrooms with both capabilities. *Video podcasts* are files that provide video as well as audio, so that students can both see and hear the lecturer and/or other visual information (e.g. lecture slides; Paulo Kushnir et al. 2011). Both video and audio podcasts can be distributed in a digital format via the internet, and obtained by streaming or by downloading to a computer or mobile device (Heilesen 2010; Kay 2012; McGarr 2009). Lecture recordings are used in a variety of contexts in higher education, where classes range from large and diverse cohorts that include students from non-English speaking backgrounds and differing pre-existing knowledge, to relatively small and homogenous groups (see Gosper et al. 2008). Additionally, they vary in their application depending on subject matter, student characteristics, the goals of the lecturer, and institutional guidelines.

2 Institutional considerations for the use of lecture recordings

In considering lecture recordings within the broader framework of WBLT, it is important to identify institutional considerations for the use of such technology. Universities have been under pressure from stakeholders to introduce lecture-recording technologies (Philips 2005). Apart from pressure from students and pedagogical reasons, which are mainly the focus of lecturers (both of which will be discussed in detail in subsequent sections), there are also many non-academic drivers influencing this move by universities, and these can be more significant than student desire and educational reasons.

In the Australian context, Phillips (2005) suggested that three main factors were associated with a shift by universities to WBLT delivery such as lecture recordings: (a) increases in student numbers (e.g. university student numbers in Australia more than doubled from 1980 to 2000; DEST 2001), (b) inadequate funding (funding to universities has not kept pace with the increase in student numbers; Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee 2001), and (c) the increased need for students to work while studying (about 85% of Australian university students also work; James et al. 2006). Universities, thus, have pressure on them to modernise, to become accessible to more students, and to become more efficient. They are also under pressure to compete with other educational institutions, locally and internationally, who are offering courses on-line (Apple 2010; Heilson 2010). Associated with this is the fear of being left behind by other universities if the new technologies are not embraced (Singh et al. 2005).

Depending on whether universities see themselves as locally or globally focused, they can adopt one of four strategic directions (Collis and Gommer 2001). They can have a *back to basics* strategy (focus on traditional, campus-based teaching, supplemented with technologies such as lecture recordings), *global campus* (with on-line students who never attend campus), *stretching the mould* (students take courses from their own or other institutions to suit their timetable, choice, and speed of progress), or *new economy* focus (on-line, world-wide courses from multiple providers). Back to basics and stretching the mould scenarios are more common than the global campus scenario, and few universities take a new economy approach (Boezeroy 2006). In Australia, the back to basics model is dominant, although stretching the mould is increasingly being taken up. The choice of direction for a university will influence the type of IT learning support selected and implemented (Shelton 2014).

Organisational implications of the introduction of lecture recordings are evident for the individual (e.g. task changes; changes to distribution of work, work climate, work group, and work appraisal processes; professional development requirements), the faculty/department (e.g. changed funding arrangements; new workload models; changes to staff numbers and profiles; curriculum changes), and the university (e.g. new funding models; changes to infrastructure requirements, including changes to the built environment; revision of policies and practices; and new marketing strategies; Gosper et al. 2008). The extent to which lecture recordings are successfully implemented will depend on the finances allocated to it, the support given by middle- and senior-level leaders, and the university's capacity to change (Couperthwaite et al. 2010). Poor uptake means the investment will be devalued and the institution might fail to meet its strategic goals.

1 In recent years, the implementation and delivery of WBLT more generally have been facilitated
2 by the rapid increase in high-speed internet access and the increasing availability of free-access support
3 sites such as YouTube. Many educational institutions have moved rapidly to implement and expand this
4 mode of delivery (Kay 2012). However, speedy adoption has also created challenges for university
5 administrators. The challenges include developing ways to manage the implementation of change-
6 processes with staff and students, bedding in and maintaining infrastructure standards, providing adequate
7 professional development for academics, creating a spirit of innovation and risk-taking in translating
8 standard lectures to on-line or on-line support, and maintaining a healthy collegiate university
9 environment (Couperthwaite et al. 2010).

10 Approaches to implementing technology that facilitates the use of lecture recordings by lecturers
11 and students parallel the introduction of other significant organisational changes, and require good
12 change-management practices (Michela and Burke 2000). Couperthwaite et al. (2010) provided
13 recommendations for universities on the uptake of WBLT based on an analysis of how eight (UK and US)
14 educational institutions undertook this task. Similar recommendations might apply to the specific case of
15 lecture recordings embedded within a broader WBLT strategy. Universities should have a *business case*
16 for adopting WBLT (e.g. target enhanced teaching or distance learning, as benefits, costs, and
17 technologies differ), formalise an *implementation plan* (e.g. relying on bottom-up staff uptake vs. large-
18 scale implementation; time-lines for roll-out), establish a *governance model* (e.g. include representatives
19 from all stakeholder groups; set targets for sustainable growth), identify *strategic targets* (e.g. who should
20 roll it out, and when; set medium- and long-term coverage goals), identify *staff development* needs and
21 implement training (e.g. training to use technology to enhance pedagogical practice and foster staff
22 engagement), and *integrate* WBLT systems into existing procedures and practices (e.g. pedagogical
23 aspects of WBLT included in teaching and learning policies and strategies). As students will require
24 training in how best to benefit from WBLT, student-focused strategies need to be developed in parallel
25 and incorporated into these strategies. Salmon and Angood (2013) also note the importance of a
26 collaborative approach involving university staff from both the academic and information technology
27 fields. Their recommendations include both individual and organizational changes needed for there to be
28 a successful integration of learning technologies into tertiary settings.

2.1 Implementation strategies, steps and technology

31 If considered along a continuum, implementation strategies can vary from being strategically and
32 centrally driven by the university to being driven by passionate individuals, whose role it is to develop
33 interest and to enthuse staff at the grass roots level. A second continuum is whether lecture recordings
34 take an evolutionary (i.e. are introduced slowly, with pilot projects, evaluations, and adjustments before
35 wider applications are considered) or revolutionary path (i.e. large scale implementation driven by
36 strategic university-based decisions). Most reported introductions have followed the tentative, bottom-up
37 pathway (Collis and Van der Wende, 2002; Gosper et al. 2008), and universities generally do not expect
38 radical introductions (Middlehurst 2003). However, formalised implementation strategies seem especially
39 important for universities, which have been described as rigid institutions with little track record in
40 incorporating technological advances, when what are required are flexible organisations with a culture of
41 risk taking and innovation (O’Hearn 2000). Universities are also “professional bureaucracies”, where
42 academic staff often hold stronger allegiances to their discipline than they do to their university, and want
43 to control the content, method, and materials used in their courses. This adds another layer of complexity
44 to the implementation of new technologies (Mintzberg 1983), although this autonomy is increasingly
45 being eroded (Fulton 2003).

46 Steps for the introduction of new technologies need to include pre-initiation and initiation phases
47 (when early-adopters can explore and experiment with the new technologies), an implementation phase
48 (when the organisation or units within the organisation determine a strategic direction), and an
49 institutionalisation phase (when the change is organisationally driven by incorporating it into core policies
50 and processes; Collis and Moonen, 2001). Universities can be identified at all three levels of introduction,
51 although there is a general movement towards institutional-based processes for most universities in
52 Western countries (OECD 2005; Smith 2005). Steps to be taken for the successful implementation of new
53 technologies include articulating a vision for teaching and learning, prioritizing courses/programs that
54 could be enhanced by using lecture recordings, fostering early-users of lecture recordings, and identifying
55 units/areas within the university for strategic investment for uptake (Bates 2000). However, little research
56 has assessed the value of these steps; whereas much more is known about student and staff perceptions of
57 the use of technology in general, and lecture recordings in particular.

1 Many universities have already invested substantially in information technology (IT) and IT staff
2 to manage the infrastructure that supports the delivery of innovative teaching. At the same time, in many
3 cases, fewer resources have been provided to staff and students to facilitate better teaching and learning,
4 meaning support has disproportionately focused on technology rather than people development (Burnett
5 and Meadmore 2002; Gosper et al. 2008). Many academic staff express negative attitudes towards WBLT
6 such as lecture recordings and do not have the required technical or presentation skills, and many students
7 do not use or do not know how to access WBLT (Kay 2012). Staff and student development activities
8 require adequate time and resources for training. Academic staff also require a safe and supportive
9 environment in order to develop their skills in using new technologies (Joy et al. 2014). Adjustments to
10 teaching workload models and management practices also need to be considered. Heilesen (2010)
11 suggested that WBLT can have a “positive impact on the academic environment”, but this will depend on
12 how the technology is introduced and how well it is adopted by staff. Students and lecturers are key
13 stakeholders in whether lecture recordings are implemented and how they are adopted. Thus, it is
14 important to consider their perceptions and how these are influencing their behaviour to engage or not
15 with the technology. It is also important to examine the link between the use of lecture recordings and
16 student learning and achievement.

17 **3 Student perceptions and use of lecture recordings**

18
19 Research on students has addressed their perceptions of lecture recordings, how they use lecture
20 recordings, and the various outcomes for students, including the effects on class attendance and academic
21 performance. In terms of perceptions, students are generally positive about having lecture recordings
22 available (Gosper et al. 2008; Heilesen 2010; McGarr 2009; Pons et al. 2013; Traphagan et al. 2010).
23 Lecture recordings are viewed more positively by second and third year students than first year students
24 (Chester et al. 2011). Chester et al. (2011) suggested that this difference might be because first year
25 students are dealing with transition issues. Students generally also regard lecture recordings as important
26 to their course satisfaction (Traphagan et al. 2010).

27
28 A number of studies have considered how and why students use lecture recordings. Most
29 students rate lecture recordings as useful (Copley 2007; Maynor et al. 2013), and 79% believe it
30 contributes to their learning (Gosper et al. 2008). There is also potential for students to gain further
31 benefit from lecture recordings. McGrath (2015), for example, recommends that students be supported in
32 their use of lecture capture so that the recordings are used to enhance the effectiveness of their study. This
33 is consistent with findings by Mather et al. (2015) who found that students from some disciplines
34 believed that lack of support in the use of lecture capture technology had a negative impact on their
35 learning.

36
37 Students also state that they use lecture recordings “frequently” and find it easy to use (Vajoczki
38 et al. 2010). Indeed, 93% would like to see more lecture material in podcast form (Copley 2007). Students
39 report that lecture recordings make it easier for them to understand content and to learn (Gosper et al.
40 2008; Traphagin et al. 2010). Students use the recordings to review concepts and issues (Lonn and
41 Teasley, 2009; Pons et al. 2013) and to fill gaps where information was not comprehended fully
42 (Leadbeater et al. 2013; McCredden and Baldock, 2009). McCunn and Newton (2015) found some
43 evidence of a relationship between an increased number of times lecture capture material was accessed
44 and greater perceived difficulty of the material, surface learning, and gender although they did not
45 examine the way in which students used the lecture capture material (e.g. to supplement or replace the
46 actual lecture).

47
48 Students also value the opportunity lecture recordings provide to learn at their own pace (Chester
49 et al. 2011; Cooke, Watson, Blakclock, and Manash, 2012), and they like being able to review repeatedly
50 or skip material depending on their needs (McCombs and Liu, 2007; Sadik, 2015; Toppin, 2011). Lecture
51 recordings are used also to make up for missed classes (Leadbeater et al. 2013; Pons et al. 2013). While
52 students occasionally use lecture recordings following classes, mostly to review specific concepts, lecture
53 recordings are considered particularly useful when revising for exams (Copley 2007). Indeed, Vajoczki
54 et al. (2010) and von Konsky et al. (2009) found the heaviest use of recordings was in the week prior to tests
55 or exams. Students in McCombs and Liu’s (2007) study also reported that lecture recordings reduced the
56 time they needed to spend on study (36% of students) and reading (17% of students).

57
58 Different groups of students, however, do vary in their usage. Leadbeater et al. described the
59 differing ways in which “low users” and “high users” made use of lecture recordings. Low users adopted
60 a highly targeted approach; whereas, high users more often listened to the whole lecture and downloaded
61 more lectures. Chang (2007) found that both students and academics agreed that lecture recordings should
62
63
64
65

1 be used for equity reasons, such as illness, family needs, disability, and work commitments. High using
2 special needs students included non-English speaking background (NESB) students and students with a
3 disability, such as learning disability (Leadbeater et al. 2013; Paulo Kushnir et al. 2011; Taplin et al.
4 2014). Cooke et al. (2012) also identified that 65% of students considered online lectures helped them to
5 cope with work and life commitments, including distance to travel to university, with many students in
6 Pons et al.'s (2013) study also reporting this.

7 Students also recognise the limitations of lecture recordings. Gosper et al. (2008) found that
8 while 68% of students using lecture recordings believed that they could learn as effectively from them as
9 they could from face-to-face contact, 50% also agreed that lectures were worth attending for the visual
10 aids, the motivation generated, and the value added by lecturers. Other studies have found that students do
11 not regard lecture recordings as a substitute for face-to-face lectures, as face-to-face lectures provide
12 richer interpersonal information (Bassili 2008; Fardon 2003) and allow the opportunity to gain immediate
13 feedback from questions (McKinney and Page 2009); although one study indicated that students preferred
14 pre-recorded lectures to lectures recorded live (Toppin 2011). Additionally, some students report that the
15 difficulty they have in accessing lecture recordings is a disadvantage (McKinney 2009).

16 3.1 Effects on student attendance 17

18 Two outcomes of using lecture recordings that have been well researched are the effects on attendance
19 and performance. Many academics express concern about the effects of lecture recordings on lecture
20 attendance (Chang 2007; Secker and Bond 2010). Students also report that the availability of lecture
21 recordings encourages them to miss classes (Brotherton and Abowd 2004; Maynor et al. 2013). Yet, there
22 have been mixed findings regarding student attendance. Traphagan et al. (2010) found a significant
23 relationship between webcast viewing and absenteeism (although they also found that the availability of
24 other course materials, such as PowerPoint slides or lecture notes, had a greater negative effect than
25 webcasting). Others (Hove and Corcoran, 2008; Walls et al. (2010) found no relationship between the use
26 of lecture recordings and student attendance. Reports from students themselves are that attendance for
27 many is the same as for courses with no recordings (43%), that attendance is reduced (55%), or
28 terminated entirely (2%; Owsten et al. 2011). When students were asked prospectively, 57% suggested
29 that WBLT such as lecture recordings would have no effect, 12% thought it would reduce their
30 attendance, and 31% said their attendance would reduce depending on the lecture content (Copley 2007).
31 In other studies, reports from students were that lecture recordings had no effect on attendance
32 (DeAngelis 2009, cited in Toppin 2011; McLure 2008). More generally, it has been argued that lecture
33 recordings are used more by students to supplement or enhance lectures attended rather than in lieu of
34 lectures (Copley 2007; Traphagen et al. 2010). It is important to note that most of these studies relied
35 on self-reports by students about attendance rather than measuring attendance, and Chester et al. (2011)
36 found that students overestimate their lecture attendance. Nonetheless, there was no systematic pattern of
37 results for studies using lecturer ratings of attendance or student self-reports, indicating that associations
38 are likely to be influenced by contextual factors.

39 The effects of lecture recordings on student attendance interact with both the quality of the
40 lectures and the quality of the student. Kolowich (2009) found that poorly attended lectures had lecture
41 capture recordings that were watched less frequently than well attended lectures. Similarly, Von Kinsky
42 et al. (2009) argued that the greater the perceived value of recordings, the more likely students were to
43 use them. It is also the case that higher achieving students attend more lectures (von Kinsky et al. 2009)
44 and there is evidence that attendance is positively correlated with course grade (Hove and Corcoran
45 2008). At the same time, Von Kinsky et al. found that passing students were more likely to supplement
46 lectures with recordings; whereas, failing students did not. In contrast, Owston et al. (2011) found that
47 higher achieving students viewed recordings significantly less often than low achievers and also tended to
48 fast forward and view certain sections of recordings only once; whereas, low achievers viewed the entire
49 recording multiple times. A key difference in these studies is that Von Kinsky measured attendance using
50 signed slips by students and documented use of recordings; whereas, Owston et al. used self-reports of
51 attendance and use.

52 3.2 Effects on academic performance 53 54

55 Additionally, there is mixed evidence about the effects of lecture recordings on student grades. In terms
56 of student perceptions, Gosper et al. (2008) found 67% of students reported that lecture recordings
57 improved their performance, and similarly, Paulo Kushnir et al. (2011) found that students believed that
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 lecture recordings helped them attain higher grades. Hove and Corcoran (2008), in one of the few studies
2 that used a control group, found that students with higher grades attended class more often regardless of
3 the format, and students with unlimited access to lecture recordings had higher grades than those in the
4 traditional mode. This latter effect was moderated by attendance: the unlimited access to lecture format
5 was more beneficial for students with lower attendance. Williams and colleagues (2012) also found that
6 lecture recordings benefited students who used them as a supplement, rather than a substitute for lecture
7 attendance. In contrast, Paulo Kushnir et al. and Leadbeater et al. (2013) found no effect on grades for
8 students who used podcasts when compared to those who did not, although Leadbeater et al. found
9 evidence that lecture capture might encourage a surface learning attitude. Traphagan et al. (2010)
10 suggested that webcasting appears to nullify the effects on grades caused by not attending lectures.
11 Traphagan et al. also found that having webcasts reduced student anxiety about the course. However, in
12 one of the most sophisticated analyses of the relationship between use of lecture recordings and grades,
13 Williams et al. found that the students who derived the most benefit from watching lecture recordings
14 were the students who also attended the majority of lectures. The lecture recordings had almost no benefit
15 for students who attended few lectures. Overall, there is no consistent finding of benefit of lecture
16 recordings on student grades, although student grades are not the only outcome measure that might
17 interest institutions. Young (2008), for example, argues that courses with technologies such as lecture
18 recordings will have lower drop-out rates, although this is anecdotal as we could find no studies to
19 confirm this suggestion.

20 Overall, the research suggests a range of benefits of lecture recordings for students, and few
21 negative effects. Students evaluate the availability of lecture recordings positively and perceive they
22 contribute to their learning, particularly for reviewing concepts not fully understood, and when revising
23 for exams. Lecture recordings are also advantageous for a range of equity reasons. At the same time, the
24 evidence is mixed regarding their effect on both student attendance and academic performance. However,
25 there is no strong evidence of a negative effect on either attendance or outcome. Indeed, there is more
26 evidence of a positive effect on student outcomes.

27 **4 Lecturer perceptions and use of lecture recordings**

28
29 The effective application of lecture recordings in higher education requires the support of lecturers who
30 are willing to adopt the technology and integrate it in their curriculum. However, perceptions about
31 WBLT, and lecture recordings in particular, can vary considerably across lecturers. For example, a study
32 conducted across four Australian universities showed that 55% of lecturers reported the use of such
33 technology to be a positive experience, whereas there was still a significant proportion of 27% who
34 reported its use to be negative (Gosper et al. 2008). Some lecturers can be reluctant to adopt lecture
35 recordings because of the perception that the benefits to them and their students are minimal or unknown
36 (Chang 2007; Secker et al. 2010) or that the use of such technology will negatively affect lecture
37 attendance (Chang 2007; Secker et al. 2010; Vajoczki et al. 2010). For reasons such as these, it is
38 important to better understand lecturers' perceptions of lecture recordings and how these might influence
39 the presentation of their lectures and design of the curricula for their courses.

40
41 A range of reasons for using lecture recordings has been noted by lecturers. Some lecturers
42 believe that students expect them to use lecture recording technology when it is available (Chang 2007;
43 Gosper et al. 2008). Lecturers might fear that a failure to use lecture recording when students want it will
44 negatively affect student evaluations of their teaching, even though universities also encourage or even
45 mandate the recording of lectures whenever classes are taught in a suitably enabled lecture theatre. Aside
46 from the perceived pressure, lecturers cite using lecture recordings to accommodate students who cannot
47 attend lectures in person due to factors such as family or work commitments and illness (Chang 2007;
48 Gosper et al. 2008). Equity for students with special needs or those who are NESB is also regarded as a
49 valid reason (Chang 2007; Gosper et al. 2008). Lecturers might also use lecture recordings to improve
50 their own lecture performance, to avoid having to repeat lectures, and to help students cope with
51 lecturers' accent (Gosper et al. 2008).

52
53 While the advantages of using lecture recordings have been noted by lecturers, reasons for not
54 adopting the technology have also been recognised. The most common concern is the belief that lecture
55 recordings will reduce attendance at class (Chang 2007; Maynor et al. 2013; Secker et al. 2010; Vajoczki
56 et al. 2010). Gosper et al. (2008) found that 55% of lecturers reported that attendance at their lectures had
57 decreased due to the use of lecture recordings, although 21% disagreed with this claim and the remaining
58 24% were neutral. There is a significant, negative correlation between lecture capture usage and
59 attendance, although students appear not to be merely substituting lecture capture for attendance (Taplin
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 et al. 2014). Related to the issue of lecture attendance is the more general issue of student engagement.
2 Some lecturers have expressed concern that students might use lecture recordings as a substitute for
3 interaction (Chang 2007). By not attending the lectures, students will have less opportunity to interact
4 with teaching staff and with fellow students, at least in the traditional face-to-face manner. Students might
5 also engage less with the subject they are studying, which could result in a more surface approach to
6 learning.

7 Lecturer perceptions of the effect of lecture recordings on student learning outcomes are mixed.
8 Gosper et al. (2008) found that 53% of lecturers reported that lecture recordings made it easier for
9 students to learn and achieve results. Toppin (2010) found that 67% of faculty staff reported learning
10 performance differences between students who viewed certain topics versus those who did not. However,
11 lecturers have been unwilling to claim changes in student performance as directly due to lecture
12 recordings (Chang 2007). This might reflect that lecture recordings are seen as one part of a large suite of
13 additional resources that students have available to them (Neumann et al. 2011) and that lecture
14 recordings might have positive and negative effects simultaneously.

15 Another concern raised by lecturers is the belief that the restrictions imposed by lecture
16 recording technology do not suit their “style” of lecturing, that it constrains their teaching approach, or
17 that it does not suit the types of activities they use during class (Fardon 2003; Secker et al. 2010; Taplin et
18 al. 2014). Lecturers who present lectures in a traditional manner (e.g. standing behind a podium
19 delivering information) are viewed to be highly suited for lecture recordings (Chang 2007). However,
20 given that lecturers differ in their lecturing style and that there is no necessarily “right” way of lecturing
21 (Fardon 2003), any potential impact of making recordings of lectures will vary from lecturer to lecturer.
22 For example, based on the classification scheme of lecturing styles developed by Behr (1988), lecture
23 recording would have a greater effect for the “dramatic presenter” than the “information provider”. Also,
24 there would be minimal impact for Behr’s classification styles of “visual presenter” and “structured
25 presenter”, unless the lecture recording was audio only. It is possible that lecture recordings will actually
26 be beneficial for students when their lecturer naturally adopts certain lecturing styles. The “information
27 provider” (Behr 1988) tends to present dense, content rich lectures and might read from prepared notes.
28 The increased chance of missing information with this style of lecturing can be negated by the student
29 being able to repeat relevant sections of the lecture recording (Fardon 2003). On the other hand, lecture
30 recordings that show only information presented via the computer or document camera do not pick up the
31 body language and facial expressions of the lecturer, although this could be compensated for somewhat
32 by lecturers exaggerating their vocal expression or including a video component of themselves in the
33 recording. Interactivity between the lecturer and the students is a potentially difficult component to
34 adequately address through the use of technology when lecture recordings are delivered in an
35 asynchronous manner (Chu 1999).

36 The addition of lecture recordings has the potential to significantly influence the behaviour of
37 the lecturer, and potentially, their effectiveness in engaging students in learning. This issue is particularly
38 salient when lecturers attempt to use novel approaches to engage students (e.g. Neumann et al. 2009,
39 2013; Neumann et al. 2010). Lecturers might need to adapt their behaviour to suit the technology, such as
40 using the microphone, repeating questions made by students, or using visual aids associated with the
41 presentation software (e.g. mouse pointer). In one study, the majority of lecturers (75%) reported that they
42 have not changed the structure of their classes and assessment due to the introduction of lecture
43 recordings (Gosper et al. 2008). However, in the same sample, more than half reported that the use of
44 lecture recordings had changed their lecturing style or what was done in the lecture. The same survey
45 found that a third of lecturers adjusted their behaviours during the lecture, such as restricting their
46 movements around the lecture theatre. A similar number of lecturers reported changing the activities done
47 during lectures and using less multimedia content due to copyright restrictions. Chang (2007) reported
48 that approximately half of the lecturers became more conscious of their presentation in class. This
49 included not presenting inappropriate material or saying things that could be viewed negatively.

50 Chang (2007) noted that given the possibility that lecture recordings will affect student
51 engagement and attendance at lectures, it might be necessary for lecturers to rethink the role that they
52 play within a course. Moreover, it might be necessary to consider using additional contact time during
53 other classes (e.g. tutorials, laboratory classes) or outside of class (e.g. student consultations) to make up
54 for any loss due to the use of lecture recordings. However, given the current limitations in lecture
55 recording technology, this might have the drawback of steering lectures increasingly towards an
56 information supply format and less towards personal interaction and engaging activities. This is consistent
57 with the notion that the lecture format is an effective method for transmitting information and that there is
58 little evidence that it is effective for provoking thought and changing attitudes (Bligh 2000). Indeed,
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 lecture recordings have been criticised for tending to reinforce the model of lectures as the mere
2 transmission of information (Donnan et al. 2004).

3 Chang (2007) also noted that many lecturers believed it was important for them to add value for
4 students who attended the lectures. There can be a blurring of the lines in whether this “value adding” is
5 aimed at rewarding attendance. To give students who attend lectures something extra, lecturers have
6 taken advantage of the limitations of lecture recordings. Such strategies can include handing out resources
7 to students in class, using extensive discussions with students, stopping the recordings for interaction with
8 students or the showing of copyrighted material, and using demonstrations. Some lecturers have adopted
9 strategies of recording student attendance at lectures and awarding marks for attendance (Gosper et al.
10 2008). However, such strategies do not address the issue that students should be able to access recorded
11 lectures if they learn just as well from them as they do in face-to-face lectures.

12 From research to date, it is clear that a major issue that needs addressing in the implementation
13 of lecture recordings is lecturer perceptions of the technology. The perceptions that lecture recordings
14 have few or uncertain benefits for lecturers are an impediment to their adoption. While universities might
15 mandate the compulsory use of lecture recordings, this is not necessarily the best strategy for expanding
16 its use. The adoption of new technology requires the user to perceive benefits in its use (Sugar et al.
17 2004). Lecturers should be informed of the advantages of lecture recordings both for themselves and their
18 students. The advantages can include the ability to archive lectures, to improve upon lecturing style, using
19 prior lectures when it has not been possible to give a face-to-face lecture (e.g. due to illness, technology
20 problems), and using recorded material in assessment or in other classes of the subject (Chang 2007).
21 Lecturers should also be informed of the potential drawbacks of the approach and how any limitations can
22 be minimised or avoided. However, it should also be emphasised that lecture recordings need not limit the
23 use of engaging and well-designed face-to-face lectures (Horvath et al. 2013).

24 5 Future research directions

26 The research suggests a range of benefits of lecture recordings for students, and few negative effects.
27 However, although research to date has used large samples of students from a wide variety of disciplines
28 and institutions and across different year levels, many studies are descriptive, based on self-reports, and
29 have few links to learning theories to explain findings. By applying principles from learning theories into
30 the design and presentation of the curriculum and the presentation of lectures, future research into lecture
31 recording technologies might lead to better learning outcomes for students. Research using theories such
32 as Mayer’s (1997) *cognitive theory of multimedia learning* has led to various evidence-based principles
33 and recommendations that can be used to improve the design of multimedia instruction, including lecture
34 recordings (e.g. Mayer, 1997, 2011; Mayer and Johnson, 2008; Moreno, 2006). A complementary theory
35 relevant to the practice of lecture recordings is *media richness theory* which emphasises that when
36 individuals are presented with ambiguous tasks, where information can be interpreted in multiple and
37 possibly conflicting ways, the richer the media, the better the learner’s performance (Daft and Lengel,
38 1984, 1986; Daft et al. 1987; Webster and Trevino, 1995).

39 Another important area to be addressed in future research is the need for studies using large,
40 demographically representative samples of lecturers. Research focusing on lecturers (but not students) has
41 generally used qualitative methodology and small samples (e.g., 11 academics in Chang 2007). While
42 these initial studies have been useful to gain rich information about lecturer perceptions and practices,
43 more extensive research is required to generate conclusions that can be applied to the wider population of
44 lecturers. Moreover, this would permit comparisons across different subgroups. For example, this might
45 answer questions regarding whether perceptions of use of lecture recordings differ among lecturers of
46 different academic rank, experience, age, or subject discipline.

47 It is also important for future research to collect parallel data from lecturers and students. In
48 some cases, this collection of data from students allowed for the confirmation of findings obtained from
49 the lecturers (e.g. Chang 2007). However, in other cases, it is apparent that lecturers hold different
50 perceptions about lecture recordings to that of students. For example, 80% of students reported that
51 lecture recordings made it easier for them to learn, and 67% reported that it helped them achieve better
52 results (Gosper et al. 2008). In contrast, the same study found that only 53% of lecturers agreed that
53 lecture recordings benefited student learning and performance. Toppin (2011) compared responses from 7
54 lecturers and 319 students on similar items of a survey and concluded that the two groups differed in
55 perceptions about student performance as a result of using lecture recordings. For reasons such as these,
56 the use of lecture recordings will be influenced by differences in the way it is perceived by both lecturers
57 and students (McGarr 2009). In addition, lecturer perceptions might be influenced by the lack of
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 information about the effects of lecture recordings on their students, citing that they have no real evidence
2 of its benefits or drawbacks for student learning (Gosper et al. 2008).

3 While lecturer perceptions are important, they can be discordant with the actual behaviours of
4 students and the needs and desires of universities. For this reason, it is important that lecture attendance is
5 objectively quantified and related to the use of lecture recordings for a course. It is also important to
6 understand what other variables affect lecture attendance independent of lecture recordings (e.g. time of
7 day of lecture, ease of access to university campus, demographics of students) as these are potential
8 confounding variables. The lecturers themselves are also an important variable. Kolowich (2009), for
9 example, noted that lecturers who had well-attended lectures also had frequently watched lecture
10 recordings, whereas other lecturers who had poorly-attended lectures had their lecture recordings watched
11 less frequently. In other words, good lecturers will attract students to their lectures regardless of whether
12 the lectures are delivered only face-to-face, only on-line, or through both modes.

13 Concerns over the reliability of the technology also inhibit lecturers' adoption of lecture
14 recordings (Secker et al. 2010). Related to this is a need for guidelines on *how* to use the relevant
15 technology. This should be done in a way that does not detract from the face-to-face lecture (e.g.
16 minimizing movement might aid with the recording of lectures but negatively affects the face-to-face
17 lecture). There is also limited research on what qualities of technologies, such as lecture recordings, make
18 them more or less effective for students. There is also a need to increase the use of psychometrically
19 sound measures that would allow comparisons among studies and reduce reliance on dichotomous
20 (yes/no) items.

21 **6 Concluding Comments**

22 There are a range of factors that have been driving the adoption of lecture recordings in universities.
23 These include pedagogic reasons, as well as students both desiring and increasingly expecting lecture
24 recordings to be available, in part driven by the increasing hours that students are engaged in external
25 work. Moreover, universities are also aware of the need to be seen to make use of new technologies.
26 However, successful implementation of lecture recordings requires an implementation strategy that takes
27 account of the changes needed at individual, faculty and the university levels. We proposed that
28 Couperthwaite et al.'s (2010) model provides a useful implementation framework for universities to use.
29 While many universities change using a bottom up approach, we recommend an institutional based
30 approach, especially for universities with little experience implementing technological advances. Such an
31 approach needs to include a focus on both the people and technology aspects of introducing lecture
32 capture.

33 Specifically, we recommend that:

- 34 1) Students are educated in how to use the technology to enhance their learning. This includes students
35 gaining a better understanding of how it can be best used as a supplement to face-to-face attendance at
36 lectures and recognising the drawbacks if used as a replacement for lecture attendance;
- 37 2) Lecturers are educated about the benefits of lecture capture for student learning. This includes
38 correcting misunderstandings, such as that lecture capture will inevitably cause a decline in student
39 attendance;
- 40 3) Lecturers are provided with training in the effective use of lecture capture. This includes an
41 understanding of what teaching styles and approaches are best suited to lecture capture. Such training
42 should also focus on how lecturers can enhance interaction and engagement, and foster deep learning; and
- 43 4) Institutions provide the necessary technological support so that lecture capture technology is reliable
44 and easy to use by students and lecturers. Moreover, the technology should also ensure that the recordings
45 are high quality with clear audio.

46 In conclusion, we have reviewed the relevant literature on lecture recordings from the student,
47 lecturer, and institutional perspectives, and made recommendations for its effective use across the three
48 domains. While much insight can be gained from the studies to date, we have been critical of the breadth,
49 depth, and quality of this research. Advancing our understanding of this form of delivery will require
50 sizeable additional research. The research in the WBLT area has not kept pace with that of the roll-out
51 of the technologies, which is now inexorable. The question for academics and universities is not whether
52 to use the technologies; the question for both is how the technologies can be best applied to benefit all
53 parties involved, particularly the students. This needs to be the focus for future research.

54 **Acknowledgements**

55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

We are grateful to Mitchell Shepherd and Miriam Emad for database literature searches and/or manuscript formatting. This project was supported by strategic funding to the Teaching in Psychology Research Group, School of Applied Psychology, Griffith University.

References

- Apple (2010). *Why podcasting matters*. <http://www.apple.com/education/podcasting/>. Accessed 18 August 2014.
- Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee (2001). *Key statistics on higher education*. http://www.avcc.edu.au/policies_activities/resource_analysis/key_stats/kstats.htm. Accessed 20 August 2014.
- Bassili, J. N. (2008). Media richness and social norms in the choice to attend lectures or to watch them online. *Journal of Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia*, 17, 453-475.
- Bates, T. (2000). *Managing technological change: Strategies for college and university leaders*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Behr, A. L. (1988). Exploring the lecture method: An empirical study. *Studies in Higher Education*, 13, 189-200.
- Bligh, D. (2000). *What's the use of lectures?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Brotherton, J. A., Abowd, G. D. (2004). Lessons learned from eClass: Assessing automated capture and access in the classroom. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction*, 11, 121-155.
- Boezeroy, P. (2006). *E-learning strategies of higher education institutions*. <http://www.utwente.nl/mb/cheps/publications/publications%202006/thesisboezeroy>. Accessed 10 October 2014.
- Burnett, B. M., & Meadmore, P. J. (2002) Streaming lectures: Enhanced pedagogy or simply "bells and whistles"? In P. L. Jeffery (Ed.), *Australian Association for Research in Education 2002*, Brisbane. <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/15757/>. Accessed 18 October 2014.
- Chang, S., (2007). Academic perceptions of the use of Lectoria: A University of Melbourne example. In *ICT: Providing choices for learners and learning. Proceedings of Ascilite, Singapore 2007*. <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/singapore07/procs/chang.pdf> 6/1/08. Accessed 10 August 2014.
- Chester, A., Buntine, A., Hammond, K., & Atkinson, L. (2011). Podcasting in education: Student attitudes, behaviour and self-efficacy. *Educational Technology and Society*, 14, 236-247.
- Chu, K. C. (1999). *What are the benefits of virtual laboratory on student learning?* HERDSA Annual International Conference, Melbourne, Australia, July 1999.
- Collis, B. A., & Gommer, E. M. (2001). Stretching the mold, or a new economy? Part 1: Scenarios for the university in 2005. *Educational Technology*, 41, 5-18.
- Collis, B. A., & Moonen, J. (2001). *Flexible learning in a digital world: Experiences and expectations*. London, UK: Kogan Page.
- Collis, B. A., & Wende, M. C. van der (Eds.) (2002). *Models of technology and change in higher education: An international comparative survey on the current and future use of ICT in Higher Education*. Enschede; University of Twente.
- Cooke, M., Watson, B., Blacklock, E., & Manash, M. (2012). Lecture capture: First year nurses' experiences of a web-based lecture technology. *Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 19, 14-21.
- Copley, J. (2007). Audio and video podcasts of lectures for campus-based students: Production and evaluation of student use. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 44, 387-399.
- Couperthwaite, J., Hinrichsen, J., & Shields, C. (2010). Modelling institutional approaches to web-based lecture technologies. In C. H. Steel, M. J. Keppell, P. Gerbic, & S. Housego (Eds.), *Curriculum, technology and transformation for an unknown future. Proceedings of Ascilite, Sydney 2010* (pp. 236-239). <http://ascilite.org.au/conferences/sydney10/procs/Couperthwaite-poster.pdf>. Accessed 15 September 2014.
- Daft, R. L. & Lengel, R. H. (1984). Information richness: A new approach to managerial behavior and organizational design. In L. L. Cummings and B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (pp. 191-233). Homewood, IL: JAI Press.
- Daft, R. L. & Lengel, R. H. (1986). Organizational information requirements, media richness and structural design. *Management Science*, 32, 554-571.
- Daft, R. L., Lengel, R. H., & Trevino, L. K. (1987). Message equivocality, media selection, and manager performance: Implications for information systems. *MIS Quarterly*, 355-366.

- 1 Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST). (2001). *Higher education students: Time series*
2 *tables, 2000: Department of Education, Science and Training.*
3 <http://www.dest.gov.au/highered/statistics/timeseries/timeseries00.pdf>. Accessed 18 August 2014.
- 4 Donnan, P., Kiley, M., & McCormack, C. (2004). Lecture streaming: Getting the pedagogy right. In *OLT*
5 *2004* (pp. 44-52). Queensland, Australia.
- 6 Fardon, M. (2003). Internet streaming of lectures: A matter of style. In *Proceedings of Educause in*
7 *Australasia, Adelaide, SA, 2009.*
8 <http://www.caudit.edu.au/educauseaustralasia/2003/educause/pdf/author/ed031010.pdf>. Accessed 14
9 May 2014.
- 10 Fulton, O. (2003). Managerialism in UK universities: Unstable hybridity and the complications of
11 implementation. In A. Amaral., V. L. Meek, and I. M. Larsen (Eds.), *The higher education*
12 *managerial revolution?* (pp. 275-296). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- 13 Gosper, M., Green, D., McNeill, M., Phillips, R., Preston, G., & Woo, K. (2008). *The impact of web-*
14 *based lecture technologies on current and future practices in learning and teaching.*
15 <http://www.cpd.mq.edu.au/teaching/wblt/overview.htm>. Accessed 20 June 2014.
- 16 Hall, R. H. (1991). *Organizations, structures, processes and outcomes.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice
17 Hall.
- 18 Heilesen, S. B. (2010). What is the academic efficacy of podcasting? *Computers and Education*, 55,
19 1063-1068.
- 20 Hove, M. & Corcoran, K. (2008). If you post it, will they come? Lecture availability in
21 introductory psychology. *Teaching of Psychology*, 35, 91-95.
- 22 Horvath, Z., O'Donnell, J. A., Johnson, L. A., Karimbux, N. Y., Shuler, C. F., & Spallek, H. (2013). Use
23 of lecture recordings in dental education: Assessment of status quo and recommendations. *Journal of*
24 *Dental Education*, 77, 1431-1442.
- 25 James, R., Bexley, E., Devlin, M., & Marginson, S. (2006). *Australian university student finances 2006.*
26 <http://www.universitiesaustralia.edu.au/resources/272/135>. Accessed 14 September 2014.
- 27 Joy, M., Foss, J., King, E., Sinclair, J., Sitthiworachart, J., & Davis, R. (2014). Incorporating technologies
28 into a flexible teaching space. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 45, 272-284.
- 29 Kay, R. H. (2012). Exploring the use of video podcasts in education: A comprehensive review of the
30 literature. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 28, 820-831.
- 31 Kolowich, S. (2009). *Fans and fears of lecture capture.*
32 <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2009/11/09/capture>. Accessed 10 June 2014.
- 33 Lonn, S. & Teasley, S. D. (2009) Podcasting in higher education: What are the implications for teaching
34 and learning? *The Internet and Higher Education*, 12, 88-92.
- 35 Mather, C., Caesar, L., Chin, C., & Fei, J. (2015). Class attendance and use of Echo360 in Australia: A
36 comparison between undergraduate nursing and maritime disciplines. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral*
37 *Sciences*, 174, 2839-2845.
- 38 Mayer, R. E. (2001). *Multimedia learning.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- 39 Mayer, R. E. & Alexander, P.A. (2011). *Handbook of research on learning and instruction.* New York,
40 NY: Routledge.
- 41 Mayer, R. E. & Johnson, C. I. (2008). Revising the redundancy principle in multimedia learning. *Journal*
42 *of Educational Psychology*, 100, 380-386.
- 43 Maynor, L. M., Barrickman, A. L., Stamatakis, M. K., & Elliott, D. P. (2013). Student and faculty
44 perceptions of lecture recording in a doctor of pharmacy curriculum. *American Journal of*
45 *Pharmaceutical Education*, 77, Article 165.
- 46 McClure, A. (2008). *Lecture capture: A fresh look.*
47 <http://www.universitybusiness.com/viewarticle.aspx?articleid=1043&p=1>. Accessed 11 May 2014.
- 48 McCombs, S., & Liu, Y. (2007). The efficacy of podcasting technology in instructional delivery.
49 *International Journal of Technology in Teaching and Learning*, 3, 123-134.
- 50 McCredden, J., & Baldock, T. (2009). More than one pathway to success: Lecture attendance, Lectopia
51 viewing and exam performance in large Engineering classes. *Proceedings from the 20th Australasian*
52 *Association for Engineering Education Conference, Adelaide, SA, 2009.*
- 53 McCunn, P., & Newton, G. (2015). Student perception of topic difficulty: Lecture capture in higher
54 education. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 31, 252-262.
- 55 McGarr, O. (2009). A review of podcasting in higher education: Its influence on the traditional lecture.
56 *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 25, 309-321.
- 57 McGrath, D. (2015). *Questions about lecture recording.* Brisbane: Institute for Teaching and Learning
58 Innovation.
- 59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 McKinney, A. A. & Page, K. (2009). Podcasts and videostreaming: Useful tools to facilitate learning of
2 pathophysiology in undergraduate nurse education? *Nurse Education in Practice*, 9, 372-376.
- 3 Michela, J. L., & Burke, W. W. (2000). Organizational culture and climate in transformations for quality
4 and innovation. In N. M. Ashkanasy, C. P. Wilderom, & M. F. Peterson (Eds.), *Handbook of*
5 *organizational culture and climate* (pp. 117-129). London, UK: Sage Publications.
- 6 Middlehurst, R. (2003). Cooperation, competition and ICT: Challenges and choices for higher education
7 institutions. In M. C. Wende & M. van der Ven (Eds.), *The use of ICT in higher education: A mirror*
8 *of Europe* (pp. 253-275). Utrecht: Lemma.
- 9 Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Structures in five. Designing effective organisations*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-
10 Hall.
- 11 Moreno, R. (2006). Learning in high-tech and multimedia environments. *Current Directions in*
12 *Psychological Science*, 15, 63-67.
- 13 Moreno, R., & Mayer, R. E. (1999). Cognitive principles of multimedia design: The role of modality and
14 contiguity. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 91, 358-368.
- 15 Morgan, G. (1986). *Images of organisation*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- 16 Neumann, D. L., Hood, M., & Neumann, M. M. (2009). Statistics? You must be joking: The application
17 and evaluation of humor when teaching statistics. *Journal of Statistics Education*, 17.
18 <http://www.amstat.org/publications/jse/v17n2/neumann.pdf>. Accessed 1 May, 2014.
- 19 Neumann, D. L., Hood, M., & Neumann, M. M. (2013). Using real-life data when teaching statistics: An
20 evaluation of its impact on student engagement and learning. *Statistics Education Research Journal*,
21 12, 59-70.
- 22 Neumann, D. L., Neumann, M. M. & Hood, M. (2011). Evaluating computer-based simulations,
23 multimedia and animations that help integrate blended learning with lectures in first year statistics.
24 *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 27, 274-289.
- 25 Neumann, D. L., Neumann, M. M., & Hood, M. (2010). The development and evaluation of a survey that
26 makes use of student data to teach statistics. *Journal of Statistics Education*, 18.
27 <http://www.amstat.org/publications/jse/v18n1/neumann.pdf>. Accessed 1 May 2014.
- 28 O'Hearn, J. (2000). Challenges for service leaders: Setting the agenda for the virtual learning
29 organization. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 12, 97-106.
- 30 OECD (2005). *E-learning in tertiary education: Where do we stand?* Paris, FR: OECD.
- 31 Owston, R., Lupshenyuk, D., & Wideman, H. (2011). Lecture capture in large undergraduate classes:
32 Student perceptions and academic performance. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 14, 262-268.
- 33 Pale, P., Petrovic, J., & Jeren, B. (2014). Assessing the learning potential and students' perception of rich
34 lecture captures. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 30, 187-195.
- 35 Paulo Kushnir, L., Berry, K., Wyman, J., & Salajan, F. (2011). Lecture capture: Good student learning or
36 good bedtime story? An interdisciplinary assessment of the use of podcasts in higher education. In T.
37 Bastiaens & M. Ebner (Eds.), *Proceedings of World Conference on Educational Multimedia,*
38 *Hypermedia and Telecommunications 2011* (pp. 3168-3178).
- 39 Phillips, R. (2005). *Challenging the primacy of lectures: The dissonance between theory and practice in*
40 *university teaching*. http://jutlp.uow.edu.au/2005_v02_i01/phillips003.html. Accessed 3 May 2014.
- 41 Pons, D., Walker, L., Hollis, J., & Thomas, H. (2013). Evaluation of student engagement with a lecture
42 capture system. *Journal of Adult Learning*, 40, 79-91.
- 43 Sadik, A. (2015). Students' preferences for types of video lectures: Lecture capture vs. screencasting
44 recordings. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 4, 94-104.
- 45 46 Salmon, G. & Angood, R. (2013). Sleeping with the enemy. *British Journal of Educational Technology*,
47 44, 916-925.
- 48 Secker, J., & Bond, S. (2010). Lecture capture: Rich and strange, or a dark art? *ALT-C 2010, University of*
49 *Nottingham, London: September 06-09*. <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/29184>. Accessed 10 May, 2014.
- 50 Shelton, C. (2014). "Virtually mandatory": A survey of how discipline and institutional commitment
51 shape university lecturers' perceptions of technology. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 45,
52 748-759.
- 53 Singh, G., O'Donoghue, J., & Worton, H. (2005). A study into the effects of e-learning on higher
54 education. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 2.
55 <http://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol2/iss1/3>. Accessed 10 May 2014.
- 56 Smith, J. (2005). From flowers to palms: Forty years of policy for online learning. *Research in Learning*
57 *Technology*, 13, 93-108.
- 58 Sugar, W., Crawley, F., & Fine, B. (2004). Examining teachers' decisions to adopt new technology.
59 *Educational Technology and Society*, 7, 201-213.
- 60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Taplin, R. H., Kerr, R., & Brown, A. M. (2014). Opportunity costs associated with the provision of
2 student services: A case study of web-based lecture technology. *Higher Education*, 68, 15-28.
- 3 Toppin, I.N. (2011). Video lecture capture (VLC) system: A comparison of student versus faculty
4 perceptions. *Education and Information Technologies*, 16, 383-393.
- 5 Traphagan, T., Kusera, J. V., & Kishi, K. (2010). Impact of class lecture webcasting on
6 attendance and learning. *Educational Technology Research and Development*,
7 58, 19-37.
- 8 Vajoczki, S., Watt, S., Marquis, N., & Holshausen, K. (2010). Podcasts: Are they an effective tool to
9 enhance student learning? A case study from McMasters University, Hamilton Canada. *Journal of*
10 *Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia*, 19, 349-352.
- 11 Von Kinsky, R. B., Ivins, J., & Gribble, J. S. (2009). Lecture attendance and web based lecture
12 technologies: A comparison of student perceptions and usage patterns. *Australasian Journal of*
13 *Educational Technology*, 25, 581-595.
- 14 Walls, S. M., Kucsera, J. V., Walker, J. D., Acee, T. W., McVaugh, N. K., & Robinson, D. H. (2010).
15 Podcasting in education: Are students as ready and eager as we think they are? *Computers &*
16 *Education*, 54, 371-378.
- 17 Webster, J. & Trevino, L. (1995). Rational and social theories as complementary explanations of
18 communication media choices: Two policy-capturing studies. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38,
19 1544-1573.
- 20 Williams, A., Birch, E., & Hancock, P. (2012). The impact of online lecture recordings on student
21 performance. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 28, 199-213.
- 22 Young, J. R. (2008). The lectures are recorded, so why go to class? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
23 <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v54/i36/36a00103.htm>. Accessed 20 May 2014.
- 24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65