

This is a repository copy of *To capture the research landscape of lecture capture in university education*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/166057/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Banerjee, Snehasish [orcid.org/0000-0001-6355-0470](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6355-0470) (2021) To capture the research landscape of lecture capture in university education. *Computers & education*. 104032. ISSN 0360-1315

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2020.104032>

---

**Reuse**

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND) licence. This licence only allows you to download this work and share it with others as long as you credit the authors, but you can't change the article in any way or use it commercially. More information and the full terms of the licence here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

# Computers & Education

## To capture the research landscape of lecture capture in university education

--Manuscript Draft--

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| <b>Manuscript Number:</b>    | CAE-D-20-01008R2  |
| <b>Article Type:</b>         | Research Paper  |
| <b>Keywords:</b>             | higher education; lecture capture; lecture recording; systematic review; technology-enhanced learning.  |
| <b>Corresponding Author:</b> | Snehasish Banerjee<br>University of York<br>York, UNITED KINGDOM  |
| <b>First Author:</b>         | Snehasish Banerjee  |
| <b>Order of Authors:</b>     | Snehasish Banerjee  |
| <b>Abstract:</b>             | <p>The use of lecture capture has been burgeoning in the higher education sector. Scholarly interest on the topic is also on an upward trajectory. Hence, the goal of this paper is to clarify the literature on the use of lecture capture in higher education through a systematic review, which involved 71 articles that came from Scopus and Education Resources Information Center (ERIC). The systematic review revealed that most research focused on university education in the US, the UK and Australia. The most studied Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) subject area in the sample is Biological Sciences. In contrast, the most studied non-STEM subject area is Business/Economics/Management. In terms of methods, descriptive and exploratory research dominates the research landscape while causative evidence is relatively limited. The literature includes two overarching research streams: While one focuses on the benefits of lecture capture, the other focuses on its drawbacks. Apparently, the assumption among most students is that lecture capture is helpful for learning, and among staff is that it takes a toll on attendance. Future research needs to reconcile students' perception of lecture capture, instructors' perception of lecture capture, and the reality of lecture capture. On the practical front, students should be explicitly told about the benefits and the drawbacks of lecture capture. This would ensure that they make the most of the technology. Educators are urged to reflect on why students should be attending the face-to-face sessions, and thereafter also watch the recorded lectures.</p> |

## **To capture the research landscape of lecture capture in university education**

**Author:** Snehasish Banerjee

The York Management School, University of York, Freboys Lane, Heslington, York, England, UK.

Tel: +44 (0) 1904 325013

Email: [snehasish.banerjee@york.ac.uk](mailto:snehasish.banerjee@york.ac.uk) / [snehasish\\_banerjee@ymail.com](mailto:snehasish_banerjee@ymail.com)

**Acknowledgement:** The author thanks Chaturi Liyanage who was the independent coder for this research.

## To capture the research landscape of lecture capture in university education

**Abstract:** The use of lecture capture has been burgeoning in the higher education sector. Scholarly interest on the topic is also on an upward trajectory. Hence, the goal of this paper is to clarify the literature on the use of lecture capture in higher education through a systematic review, which involved 71 articles that came from Scopus and Education Resources Information Center (ERIC). The systematic review revealed that most research focused on university education in the US, the UK and Australia. The most studied Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) subject area in the sample is Biological Sciences. In contrast, the most studied non-STEM subject area is Business/Economics/Management. In terms of methods, descriptive and exploratory research dominates the research landscape while causative evidence is relatively limited. The literature includes two overarching research streams: While one focuses on the benefits of lecture capture, the other focuses on its drawbacks. Apparently, the assumption among most students is that lecture capture is helpful for learning, and among staff is that it takes a toll on attendance. Future research needs to reconcile students' perception of lecture capture, instructors' perception of lecture capture, and the reality of lecture capture. On the practical front, students should be explicitly told about the benefits and the drawbacks of lecture capture. This would ensure that they make the most of the technology. Educators are urged to reflect on why students should be attending the face-to-face sessions, and thereafter also watch the recorded lectures.

**Keywords:** higher education; lecture capture; lecture recording; systematic review; technology-enhanced learning.

### 1. Introduction

Digital technology has been making rapid inroads in curriculum design. Specifically, lecture capture is increasingly becoming popular all across the globe (Stokel-Walker, 2019). Consistent with its surging popularity among practitioners, scholarly interest on the topic has also been on the rise in recent years. The diversity in the literature calls for synthesising the research landscape of lecture capture (Nordmann et al., 2019).

As a response to the call, the goal of this paper is to clarify and consolidate the accumulated state of knowledge regarding the use of lecture capture in higher education. The focus is particularly on higher education due to two reasons. First, the use of lecture capture is burgeoning in this sector. Over 1,000 higher education institutions worldwide use it to record more than 100 hours of lecture video every month (Stokel-Walker, 2019). In countries such as the US and the UK, more than 4 in 5 institutions utilise lecture capture (Newland, 2017; Panopto, 2020). The technology has grown in stature to such an extent that it is now noted by its absence rather than presence in higher education (Cramer, 2015; Ibrahim et al., in press).

1 Second, university students are more independent than their junior counterpart such as  
2 students in K-12 (Ary et al., 2002; Belland and Drake, 2013), who are likely to experience  
3 greater parental mediation—strategies that parents use to monitor and regulate children’s  
4 use of digital media (Warren, 2001). Therefore, lecture capture use by the former is likely to  
5 be more self-regulated and self-paced. As a result, the literature on the use of lecture capture  
6 in the higher education setting is likely to be more nuanced than that in the K-12 realm.  
7

8  
9 To achieve the research goal, a systematic literature review was conducted with the following  
10 objectives: (1) To identify the contexts that lecture capture research has explored in higher  
11 education, (2) To recognise the methods that lecture capture research in higher education  
12 has employed, and (3) To analyse the overarching research streams in the current body of the  
13 lecture capture literature in higher education.  
14

15  
16 The paper is significant on three fronts. First, the systematic review enables educators to  
17 better understand how university students use lecture capture. Second, it contributes to the  
18 academic discourse on the use of lecture capture in higher education by identifying several  
19 under-investigated research contexts, research methods, and research themes. Third, it  
20 dovetails extant systematic reviews on the broader theme of technology-enhanced learning.  
21 For one, Kay (2012) reviewed the literature on the use of vodcasts—also called video  
22 podcasts—in education including secondary school and elementary school. In contrast, this  
23 paper casts the spotlight specifically on the use of lecture capture in university education.  
24 More recently, O’Callaghan et al. (2017) conducted a systematic review on the use of web-  
25 based lecture technologies such as lecture capture, podcasts, and video streaming in  
26 Australia. In contrast, this paper seeks to offer a more in-depth review of lecture capture only  
27 but without limiting the geographical scope. In an even more recent work, Clunie et al. (2018)  
28 reviewed the literature on technology-enhanced learning tools in anatomy education—a field  
29 that is known to be at the forefront of integrating innovative technologies in the curriculum.  
30 In contrast, this paper does not restrict the review to any discipline or sub-discipline.  
31  
32

33  
34 The paper proceeds as follows: Section 2 offers a conceptualisation of lecture capture. Section  
35 3 describes the methods employed to conduct the systematic review. Section 4 discusses the  
36 findings. Finally, Section 5 highlights the paper’s contributions, limitations, implications for  
37 practice, and opportunities for further research.  
38  
39

## 40 41 42 43 44 45 **2. Conceptualising Lecture Capture** 46

47  
48 Lecture capture, as the name suggests, essentially consists of recorded or captured lectures  
49 that are then used as a learning resource by students. The recording can take place either in  
50 vitro—where lectures are delivered without any audience just for the purpose of being  
51 captured—or in vivo—where live face-to-face lectures in front of students are captured in  
52 real time (Pale et al., 2014). The scope of this paper is trained on the latter.  
53  
54

55  
56 Meanwhile, a live face-to-face lecture in front of students can take place in three formats. In  
57 one, the instructor interacts with students by writing on a traditional blackboard. No digital  
58 audio-visual element is involved. In the second format, the instructor uses the lecture-room  
59 projector to present a slideshow to the students. Other audio-visual learning materials  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 including smart boards and videos can also be displayed. The third format is one that includes  
2 a combination of the first two.  
3

4 For the purpose of this paper, lecture capture encompasses recording the activities on the  
5 lecture-room projector during a live face-to-face lecture, which takes place based on either  
6 the second or the third format, for subsequent dissemination among the students enrolled in  
7 the course. The recording notwithstanding, the students are expected to attend the face-to-  
8 face sessions. Some versions of such a lecture capture system record the lecture-room  
9 projector along with the instructor's voice. Other more encompassing versions record the  
10 instructor along with the students—both speech and video (McCunn and Newton, 2015;  
11 Newton et al., 2014). The recordings are often timestamped for ease of navigation, and can  
12 be accompanied with captions (Gorissen et al., 2015).  
13  
14  
15

16 Given the increasing smartphone penetration in people's everyday lives, lecture capture  
17 provides students, even those with a range of disabilities, with on-demand any time-any place  
18 access to lectures (Ibrahim et al., in press; McCunn and Newton, 2015). The online recordings  
19 serve as long-lasting digital footprints of live lectures that are otherwise ephemeral. Watching  
20 lecture capture is a key step in contemporary education. It allows students to revisit lectures  
21 that they had either missed or failed to understand, thereby promoting inclusivity—a theme  
22 that has been attracting much attention among higher education leaders and policy makers.  
23 Inclusive higher education seeks to not only engage every student without exclusion but also  
24 modernise the learning environment to meet contemporary learning needs (Blessinger et al.,  
25 2018; Thomas and May, 2010). It also fits well with the 2030 agenda for sustainable  
26 development of leaving no-one behind (United Nations, 2015). Clearly, the use of lecture  
27 capture seems to be a step in the right direction in this digital economy insofar as achieving  
28 inclusivity and equal access to higher education.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 Using lecture capture is however a social process that sees the confluence of not only  
35 technology but also the behaviour of students and educators (Kirschner et al., 2004). Hence,  
36 it is important to cast the spotlight on lecture capture through the lens of learning theories.  
37 The two key paradigms that lie at opposite ends of the spectrum are behaviourism and  
38 constructivism (Bichelmeyer and Hsu, 1999; Radianti et al., 2020). Behaviourism assumes  
39 objectivity and the existence of a single reality. Students acquire knowledge passively from  
40 instructors who aim to transfer the correct behavioural response to external stimuli. Learning  
41 motivation is extrinsic, involving positive and negative reinforcement. There is an emphasis  
42 on repetition and rote learning (Ertmer and Newby, 1993).  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 In contrast, according to constructivism, there are multiple realities that are subjectively  
49 constructed. Students, who are self-regulated, actively construct their own understanding of  
50 reality by linking new information to their prior experiences (Ertmer and Newby, 1993).  
51 Instructors serve as learning facilitators, rather than knowledge transmitters, who emphasise  
52 on problem solving (Bichelmeyer and Hsu, 1999). Since knowledge acquisition depends on  
53 how information is received and assimilated, digital technology can be particularly helpful for  
54 constructivist learning design (Radianti et al., 2020). Watching lecture capture after attending  
55 the face-to-face lectures is likely to help students in knowledge building from half-baked  
56 notions, thereby enabling them to gradually develop a grasp over complex problem solving  
57 (Scardamalia and Bereiter, 2010).  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 Given this conceptualisation of lecture capture that fits with constructivism, the following  
2 section presents the methods of the systematic review. The findings can be beneficial for  
3 designing technology-enhanced constructivist learning through the use of lecture capture.  
4  
5  
6

### 7 **3. Methods**

#### 8 *3.1. Literature Search*

9  
10  
11  
12 To collect relevant papers in English language as exhaustively as possible, a literature search  
13 protocol was necessary. For this purpose, pilot searches were conducted on Scopus, the  
14 largest database of peer-reviewed literature (Maflahi and Thelwall, 2016). Three observations  
15 arose. First, relevant papers used at least one of the following six alternative phrases: “lecture  
16 capture,” “lecture recording,” “lecture streaming,” “recorded lectures,” “screencasting,” or  
17 “screencast.” Second, relevant papers in the context of higher education used at least one of  
18 the following three alternative phrases: “university education,” “higher education,” or  
19 “university teaching.” Third, when the search was applied on full texts, several irrelevant  
20 articles were retrieved and the noise exceeded the data. The volume of noise was possible to  
21 reduce considerably by restricting the search on titles, abstracts and keywords.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 Guided by these initial observations, the following search query was used: (“lecture capture”  
28 OR “lecture recording” OR “lecture streaming” OR “recorded lectures” OR “screencasting” OR  
29 “screencast”) AND (“university education” OR “higher education” OR “university teaching”).  
30 The use of such Boolean operators is common in systematic literature reviews (Pal and Chua,  
31 2016; Zhang et al., 2015). The search query was applied to titles, abstracts and keywords.  
32  
33  
34

35 Two databases were used for searching: Scopus and Education Resources Information Center  
36 (ERIC). Scopus was chosen because it is well known for its comprehensive coverage (Maflahi  
37 and Thelwall, 2016). It indexes articles retrievable through several other independent  
38 academic databases such as Emerald and Springer. ERIC was chosen because it is a repository  
39 dedicated to the education literature (Clunie et al., 2018). General Google searches were  
40 avoided to exclude grey literature that may not have undergone scientific peer-review (Yli-  
41 Huomo et al., 2016). The peer-reviewed literature retrievable through Google are anyway  
42 expected to be obtained via Scopus and/or ERIC.  
43  
44  
45

46 The search was restricted to journal articles as the inclusion criterion. This was necessary for  
47 quality control as journal articles undergo more rigorous peer-review compared with either  
48 conference proceedings or book chapters. No date restriction was applied because the use of  
49 lecture capture is not an age-old phenomenon, and is therefore self-limited to the last two  
50 decades. By conducting the search in April 2020, 185 articles were retrieved.  
51  
52  
53  
54


#### 55 *3.2. Literature Screening*

56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 Figure 1 depicts the literature screening process that involved three steps. In the first step,  
2 the initial corpus of 185 articles (65 from Scopus + 120 from ERIC) was checked for duplicates.  
3 A total of 46 duplicates were identified, and eventually removed.  
4


5 In the second step, the relevance of the remaining 139 unique articles was checked by reading  
6 their titles and abstracts. Forty articles that were thematically irrelevant were removed.  
7 Whenever the relevance of an article was not possible to determine with certainty, it was  
8 retained. Seven articles related to lecture capture were also excluded. These either described  
9 the authors' personal experiences (Newton et al., 2014), did not report any empirical work  
10 (Zandona et al., 2016), or focused on the technological implementation of lecture capture  
11 (Valor Miró et al., 2014)—which are beyond the scope of this systematic review. Taken  
12 together, 47 articles were excluded.  
13  
14  
15

16 In the third step, the relevance of the remaining 92 articles was checked through analyses of  
17 their full-texts. Twenty-one articles were further excluded because they did not conform to  
18 the paper's conceptualisation of lecture capture—recording of live lectures for students who  
19 are also expected to attend the sessions face-to-face (cf. Section 2). For example, Loch et al.  
20 (2014) focused on video recordings that were not recorded during live lectures. Bahnson and  
21 Olejnikova (2017) looked into recorded lectures but did not require students to attend the  
22 live sessions face-to-face. All such instances had to be removed. Finally, 71 articles were  
23 admitted for the systematic literature review. Figure 2 shows their year-wise distribution.  
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 **Figure 1:** The literature screening process.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65





**Figure 2:** Year-wise distribution of the relevant articles on lecture capture in higher education.

### 3.3. Literature Coding and Analysis

The coding and analysis involved two steps. In the first step, the 71 articles admitted for the systematic literature review were carefully inspected. The researcher used a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet to record the following data points: study details (e.g., year of publication, geographical location of the study), research methods (e.g., qualitative / quantitative / mixed, correlational / causative), sample characteristics (e.g., subject area, undergraduate / postgraduate), lecture capture characteristics (e.g., length of recordings, number of recordings), and finally thematic focus of the paper—as identified through iterative rounds of coding (e.g., students’ attendance, academic performance) coupled with the finding with respect to the theme.


In the second step, another coder, who was a full-time postgraduate student in a large university in the UK, independently inspected all the articles. The goal was to cross-check the entries in the spreadsheet obtained from the previous step. All inconsistencies were resolved through discussion. Thus, the final spreadsheet reflected full inter-coder agreement between the researcher and the independent coder.

The involvement of the researcher, who dons the hat of an instructor with experience of leading courses that are lecture captured, along with a student in the coding procedure was particularly necessary to minimise any bias. After all, lecture capture divides instructors and students—as reflected later in the findings too.

## 4. Findings and Discussion

### 4.1. Contexts Studied by Lecture Capture Research in Higher Education

As depicted in Figure 3, among the 71 articles, much of the scholarly attention has been trained on the US (18 articles, 25.35%), the UK (18 articles, 25.35%), and Australia (15 articles, 21.13%). Beyond these top three countries that account for more than 70% of the sample, other sparingly studied research contexts include Canada, the Netherlands, Malaysia, Qatar, Taiwan, Austria, Germany, Turkey and the UAE.



**Figure 3:** Country-wise distribution of lecture capture research.


In the meantime, recent statistics suggest that more than 1,000 higher education institutions worldwide use lecture-recording tools such as Panopto to record more than 100 hours of lecture video every month (Stokel-Walker, 2019). Thus, the geographical distribution of the articles does not seem to be in line with the current trends of lecture capture usage.

Furthermore, 64 of the 71 articles (90.14%) confined the context of investigation to data from just one institution. Among the seven exceptions, six drew data from multiple institutes (Farooq et al., 2017; Gorissen et al., 2012, 2013; Gosper et al., 2010; Nightingale et al., 2019; Trenholm et al., 2019), whereas the other drew data from different campuses of the same institute (Dommett et al., 2019).

Only one article reported a comparative analysis between two countries, namely, Australia and the UK (Trenholm et al., 2019). Some discrepancies were identified. For example, in Australia, regular and irregular lecture capture users differed in terms of age. However, such a difference was non-significant in the UK. Given the limited research, this paper calls for more cross-country and cross-cultural investigations that can offer insights into differences in students' motives, behaviours and attitudes regarding lecture capture.

As shown in Figure 4, the most studied Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) subject area in the sample is Biological Sciences (29 articles, 40.84%). Informed by Nightingale et al. (2019), Biological Sciences in this paper include biochemistry, health

1 science, nursing, midwifery, medicine, pharmacy, and psychology. In contrast, the most  
2 studied non-STEM subject area is Business/Economics/Management (16 articles, 22.54%).  
3



4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24 **Figure 4:** Subject area-wise distribution of lecture capture research.

25  
26  
27 Most (58 articles, 81.69%) of the 71 articles studied lecture capture from a student-only  
28 perspective while only three had a staff-only perspective (Freed et al., 2014; Germany, 2012;  
29 Joseph-Richard et al., 2018). The remaining 10 articles offered a greater degree of  
30 triangulation by shedding light on the two perspectives in tandem. Thus, students were  
31 involved as research participants in 68 articles (58 + 10). Furthermore, staff members were  
32 involved as research participants in 13 articles (3 + 10).  
33  
34

35  
36 Among the 68 articles involving students, the spotlight was predominantly on those pursuing  
37 only undergraduate degrees (53 articles) even though they were not always clearly  
38 differentiated in terms of their year of study. Only one article specifically focused on executive  
39 students (Farooq et al., 2017). Another two focused exclusively on postgraduate students  
40 (Baker et al., 2018; Saunders and Hunt, 2015). Yet another four studied a mixture of  
41 undergraduate and postgraduate students (Dommatt et al., 2019; Dona et al., 2017; Gosper  
42 et al., 2010; Taplin et al., 2011). The scope of Caglayan and Ustunluoglu (in press) was trained  
43 on not only undergraduate and postgraduate students but also what are referred as associate  
44 students. In addition, there are a few instances where the degree pursued by the students  
45 was not clarified explicitly (e.g., Groen et al., 2016). Nevertheless, it is clear that lecture  
46 capture research is limited in the contexts of postgraduate and executive education. Future  
47 research needs to plug this contextual gap in the literature. Undergraduate students are  
48 expected to have a relatively lower level of maturity than either postgraduate or executive  
49 students. Therefore, findings gleaned from the former cannot be generalised to the latter.  
50  
51

52  
53  
54  
55 It is conceivable that the use of lecture capture throughout the world may differ in terms of  
56 factors such as length of recordings, number of recordings, and availability of recordings.  
57 Findings cannot be assumed to be the same regardless of these contextual factors. Yet,  
58 several articles refrained from providing such details (e.g., Cooke et al., 2012; Germany,  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 2012; McCunn and Newton, 2015). Among the handful of articles that included such a level  
2 of details, length of the lectures captured was mostly reported as one hour or less (e.g.,  
3 Brooks et al., 2014; Elliot and Neal, 2016; Williams et al., 2016). In three articles, duration of  
4 the lectures varied from one to two hours (Chapin, 2018; Jones and Olczak, 2016; Trenholm  
5 et al., 2019). In yet another three articles, lectures were as long as three hours (Bollmeier et  
6 al., 2010; Chen and Lin, 2012; Owston et al., 2011). The number of lecture recordings varied  
7 drastically from as low as two (Hadgu et al., 2016) to as high as 47 (Guy et al., 2018). Few  
8 articles stated exactly when the lecture recordings were released, and how long they  
9 remained available to students. A notable exception is Bollmeier et al. (2010), according to  
10 which students had access to lecture recordings for 72 hours following the live lectures.  
11  
12

#### 13 14 15 *4.2. Methods Employed by Lecture Capture Research in Higher Education* 16

17  
18 Lecture capture research does not seem to suffer from mono-method bias. This is evident  
19 from the widespread use of mixed methods. Of the 71 articles, 27 (38.03%) employed  
20 quantitative and qualitative methods in conjunction. Among the rest, purely quantitative  
21 works (40 articles, 56.34%) outnumber those that are purely qualitative (4 articles, 5.63%).  
22  
23

24 Even in terms of data source, several articles complemented the use of surveys and interviews  
25 with focus group discussions as well as tracking of student-specific data. In particular, 45  
26 articles (63.38%) reportedly administered surveys. Student-specific data—ranging from  
27 attendance and academic performance in assessments to lecture capture usage via online  
28 logs—were tracked in 40 articles (56.34%). The use of focus group discussions was evident in  
29 13 articles (18.31%). Experiments were employed in 11 articles (15.49%). Seven articles  
30 (9.86%) conducted interviews.  
31  
32

33  
34 As the widespread use of lecture capture continues to spawn a growing corpus of digital data,  
35 the scholarly community is also starting to employ novel analytical techniques on student-  
36 specific data. Three such examples are illustrated as follows: Brooks et al. (2014) used  
37 unsupervised machine learning algorithms on students' data. Luttenberger et al. (2018)  
38 applied latent class analysis. More recently, O'Brien and Verma (2019) applied cluster  
39 analysis. All of these essentially leveraged data analytics to make sense of students' lecture  
40 capture utilisation patterns.  
41  
42

43  
44 Nevertheless, correlational, descriptive and exploratory research seems to dominate the  
45 research landscape of lecture capture while causative evidence, which is possible to glean  
46 only through experiments, is still relatively limited. This could be attributed to the logistical  
47 difficulty in arranging randomized samples, random assignments, and controlling extraneous  
48 variables in university education. Drouin (2014) and Traphagan et al. (2010) are among the  
49 few exceptions that used quasi-experimental research designs to infer causation.  
50  
51

52  
53 Moreover, the methods of most articles were driven by practical concerns, and not by theory.  
54 Only a handful of works were explicitly rooted in theory. For example, Farooq et al. (2017)  
55 and Nair et al. (2015) were rooted in the unified theory of acceptance and use of technology.  
56 However, none of the articles were situated within any pedagogical or technology-mediated  
57 learning frameworks.  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 In Biological Sciences—the most studied STEM subject area (29 articles), the distribution of  
2 research methods is as follows: 9 mixed methods + 19 quantitative + 1 qualitative. At a  
3 granular level, this body of research contains 18 surveys, 17 studies that involved tracking  
4 student-specific data, five focus group discussions, five experiments, and one interview.  
5  
6

7 In Business/Economics/Management—the most studied non-STEM subject area (16 articles),  
8 the distribution of research methods is as follows: 5 mixed methods + 11 quantitative. At a  
9 granular level, this literature encompasses 10 surveys, 11 studies that involved tracking  
10 student-specific data, one focus group discussion, and two experiments. Appendix A  
11 summarises the findings of the paper corresponding to research context (Objective 1) as well  
12 as research methods (Objective 2).  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

#### 18 *4.3. Overarching Research Streams in the Lecture Capture Literature in Higher Education*

19 Reading of the lecture capture literature highlighted two overarching research streams that  
20 almost seem to collide head-on. While one research stream focuses on the benefits of lecture  
21 capture, the other focuses on its drawbacks. This is perhaps unsurprising as lecture capture  
22 tends to polarise views. Some consider it a priceless adjunct to promote inclusive education  
23 (Blessinger et al., 2018; Mallinson and Baumann, 2015) whereas others view it as a perfect  
24 recipe for non-attendance (Aldamen et al., 2015).  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 Still, the benefits of lecture capture (Table 1 and Appendix B) that this systematic review  
30 identifies outnumber the drawbacks (Table 2 and Appendix C). The top five benefits of lecture  
31 capture are as follows: It facilitates students' learning and/or revision (41 articles, 57.75%),  
32 positively impacts students' academic performance (39 articles, 54.93%), allows students a  
33 better work-life balance (31 articles, 43.66%), helps students fill in lecture notes (21 articles,  
34 29.58%), and aids students in revisiting difficult concepts (19 articles, 26.76%).  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 In contrast, the top five drawbacks of lecture capture are as follows: It has an adverse impact  
40 on lecture attendance (20 articles, 28.17%), engenders technical difficulties (19 articles,  
41 26.76%)—for both students (e.g., Al Nashash and Gunn, 2013) as well as instructors (e.g.,  
42 Germany, 2012), falls flat due to students' reluctance to watch the lecture recordings (12  
43 articles, 16.90%), attenuates instructor-student interaction (10 articles, 14.08%), and  
44 encourages surface learning and/or procrastination among students (9 articles, 12.68%).  
45  
46  
47

48 Articles that feature in neither Appendix B nor Appendix C are those that fail to offer empirical  
49 support for any benefits or drawbacks of lecture capture. For example, Bollmeier et al. (2010)  
50 found no correlation between lecture capture usage and either attendance or academic  
51 performance. Even more recently, works such as Brackenbury (in press), Hadgu et al. (2016),  
52 as well as Sarsfield and Conway (2018) did not detect any relationship between lecture  
53 capture viewing and academic performance.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

**Table 1:** List of benefits of lecture capture in higher education.

| <b>Benefits</b>                         | <b>Evident from number of articles (%)</b> |
|---|--|
| Facilitates learning &/or revision      | 41 (57.75%)                                |
| Positively impacts academic performance | 39 (54.93%)                                |
| Allows a better work-life balance       | 31 (43.66%)                                |
| Helps fill in lecture notes             | 21 (29.58%)                                |
| Aids revisiting difficult concepts      | 19 (26.76%)                                |
| Helps overcome language barriers        | 17 (23.94%)                                |
| Enhances student interest in lectures   | 10 (14.08%)                                |
| Supports students with disabilities     | 8 (11.27%)                                 |
| Reduces anxiety among students          | 5 (7.04%)                                  |
| Improves the quality of teaching        | 3 (4.22%)                                  |

*Note.* Percentages add to over 100 because one article could have found multiple benefits.

**Table 2:** List of drawbacks of lecture capture in higher education.

| <b>Drawbacks</b>                                 | <b>Evident from number of articles (%)</b> |
|--|--|
| Adverse impact on lecture attendance             | 20 (28.17%)                                |
| Tackling technical difficulties                  | 19 (26.76%)                                |
| Students' reluctance to watch                    | 12 (16.90%)                                |
| Attenuates instructor-student interaction        | 10 (14.08%)                                |
| Encourages surface learning &/or procrastination | 9 (12.68%)                                 |
| Instructors' discomfort &/or self-consciousness  | 7 (9.86%)                                  |

*Note.* Percentages add to over 100 because one article could have found multiple drawbacks.

Looking at the bigger picture, a conundrum is evident. On the one hand, students as research participants almost unanimously voice their support in favour of lecture capture, which they expect will facilitate learning as well as revision—particularly when difficult concepts are involved. These in turn, students believe, will have a positive impact on academic performance. On the other hand, instructors as research participants almost unanimously express concerns about waning attendance caused by lecture capture.

In other words, the assumption among most students is that lecture capture is helpful for learning, and among staff is that it takes a toll on attendance. This is why facilitation of learning and reduction in attendance emerged as the most widely documented benefit and drawback of lecture capture respectively.

However, research suggests that lecture capture, even if it facilitates learning and/or revision among students, does not always translate to better academic performance. Works such as Franklin et al. (2011) found students to believe that lecture capture improves grades, but no significant difference was detected in reality. Likewise, Marchand et al. (2014) found students to believe that lecture capture facilitates learning but instructors saw little impact on students' performance. In fact, Drouin (2014) as well as Edward and Clinton (2019) identified a negative relationship between lecture capture use and academic performance. Drouin (2014) further revealed that even though students had a positive attitude toward lecture

1 capture, they seldom viewed the actual lecture recordings. In addition, despite the general  
2 proclivity of the scholarly community to report only significant results and under-report those  
3 that are non-significant (Kerr, 1998; Yukhymenko, 2011), it is telling that several works have  
4 indicated a non-significant association between lecture capture viewing and academic  
5 performance (Bollmeier et al., 2010; Chapin, 2018; Euzent et al., 2011; Ford et al., 2012;  
6 Hadgu et al., 2016; Leadbeater et al., 2013; Mallinson and Baumann, 2015; Sarsfield and  
7 Conway, 2018; Traphagan et al., 2010).

8  
9  
10 With respect to lecture attendance, Leadbeater et al. (2013) confirmed a negative  
11 relationship even though students thought lecture capture would not affect their willingness  
12 to attend lectures. Similarly, according to Marchand et al. (2014), students believed that  
13 lecture capture would not affect their attendance but instructors noted increased  
14 absenteeism. Nevertheless, several works also reported non-significant relations between  
15 lecture capture and attendance (Baker et al., 2018; Bollmeier et al., 2010; Davis et al., 2009;  
16 Franklin et al., 2011; Groen et al., 2016; Gysbers et al., 2011; McLean and Suchman, 2016;  
17 Nordmann et al., 2019; Shaw and Molnar, 2011; von Konsky et al., 2009; Wiese and Newton,  
18 2013; Williams et al., 2016).

19  
20  
21 A possible way to reconcile the conundrum lies in finding ways to maximise the benefits of  
22 lecture capture while minimising its drawbacks as far as possible. To this end, a few works  
23 offered useful insights. Bos et al. (2016) showed that students often end up using lecture  
24 capture as a substitute for face-to-face lectures. This in turn takes a toll on lecture attendance.  
25 Edward and Clinton (2019) suggested that overreliance on lecture capture as a replacement  
26 for lecture attendance can be problematic for student learning. Lecture capture seems to  
27 breed a sense of dependence among students, who then start to undermine the value of  
28 attending the lectures face-to-face. Ominously, even low-performing students have been  
29 shown to rely on lecture capture as a substitute rather than a supplement to live lectures,  
30 thereby taking a toll on their attendance (Aldamen et al., 2015).

31  
32  
33 Nevertheless, according to Brooks et al. (2014), students who watched lecture recordings  
34 throughout the term outperformed those who did not. Sarsfield and Conway (2018) alluded  
35 to the fact that high-achieving students tend to view the recordings for learning whereas low-  
36 achieving students view only during the exam phase. Williams et al. (2012) found a positive  
37 correlation between lecture capture and academic performance, but it was evident only  
38 among students who also went to the lectures. Similarly, von Konsky et al. (2009) suggested  
39 that higher-achieving students have a proclivity to leverage both live and recorded lectures  
40 to reinforce their learning. According to Dommeyer (2017), lecture capture has a positive  
41 impact on academic performance but it works best when it supplements rather than replaces  
42 a lecture.

43  
44  
45 Interpreting these insights in conjunction with one another, lecture capture seems to work  
46 well if and only if students use the technology as a supplementary resource—rather than an  
47 alternative—to live lectures (Bos et al., 2016; Brooks et al., 2014; Dommeyer, 2017; Edward  
48 and Clinton, 2019; Sarsfield and Conway, 2018; von Konsky et al., 2009; Williams et al., 2012).  
49 It is probably time that this point is clearly communicated to students. Instructors have a huge  
50 role to play too. If they would like students to attend lectures as well as view the recordings,  
51 the course content should be strategically designed so that there is sufficient incentive on  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 both fronts. With academia almost en route to becoming netflixised, the reason why students  
2 should be attending the face-to-face sessions needs to be carefully thought through.  
3  
4

## 5. Conclusions

5  
6  
7 This paper sought to clarify the literature on the use of lecture capture in university higher  
8 education. A systematic literature review was conducted with 71 articles in the final sample.  
9 The findings suggest that most works focus on the US, the UK and Australia. The most studied  
10 STEM subject area in the sample is Biological Sciences. In contrast, the most studied non-  
11 STEM subject area is Business/Economics/Management. In terms of methods, descriptive and  
12 exploratory research dominates the research landscape while causative evidence is relatively  
13 limited. The literature includes two overarching research streams: While one focuses on the  
14 benefits of lecture capture, the other focuses on its drawbacks. The most widely documented  
15 benefit is that lecture capture facilitates learning, and the most widely documented drawback  
16 is that it hampers attendance in face-to-face lectures. The boundary of these findings is  
17 however limited to the commonly studied contexts of the US, the UK, and Australia—  
18 particularly for undergraduate students who study Biological Sciences and Business/  
19 Economics/Management. Caution is advocated in generalising the findings beyond these  
20 boundary conditions.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 By conducting a systematic review of lecture capture at a point in time when technology is  
28 increasingly infiltrating face-to-face lectures, the paper makes two key contributions. First,  
29 the critical insights that the review offers will enable educators to better understand how  
30 students use lecture capture. Instructors will have a richer understanding of how lecture  
31 capture is helpful on some fronts, and counter-productive on others. Instructors are urged to  
32 reflect on why students should be attending the face-to-face sessions, and thereafter also  
33 watch the recorded lectures (cf. Section 5.1 for detailed implications for practice).  
34  
35  
36

37 Second, it contributes to the academic discussion on the use of lecture capture in higher  
38 education by identifying several under-investigated contexts (e.g., cross-country analysis),  
39 methods (e.g., experiments), and themes (e.g., instructors' lecture capture usage). With an  
40 attempt to shift existing paradigms, the paper hopes to ignite a body of research that can  
41 potentially reconcile students' perception of lecture capture, instructors' perception of  
42 lecture capture, and the reality of lecture capture (cf. Section 5.2 for detailed  
43 recommendations for future research).  
44  
45  
46

47 These contributions, however, need to be viewed in light of the limitation that only articles in  
48 English were considered in this systematic review. Hence, the paper does not incorporate the  
49 essence of other works on lecture capture in institutions where the medium of instruction is  
50 not English, in which case the results stand a good chance to have been published in non-  
51 English outlets.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56

### 5.1. Implications for Practice

57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1 The paper has implications for teaching practices in university education. The systematic  
2 review offers a better understanding of how students use lecture capture than what any  
3 single empirical study would afford. As such, instructors and educators could use this  
4 understanding as a basis for a more effective integration of lecture capture in teaching. They  
5 could use the findings on what is helpful (cf. Table 1 and Appendix B) and what is counter-  
6 productive (cf. Table 2 and Appendix C) pertaining to the use of lecture capture to better  
7 utilise the technology as an educational resource.  
8

9  
10 Furthermore, students should be explicitly told about the benefits and the drawbacks of  
11 lecture capture. One cannot assume students to be aware of the best practice by default. It  
12 is the responsibility of instructors and educators to raise awareness among students that  
13 lecture capture needs to be utilised as a supplementary resource rather than an alternative  
14 to face-to-face lectures. This would ensure that they make the most of the technology while  
15 obviating its drawbacks. If students are required to attend face-to-face lectures and also  
16 watch the recordings for knowledge building, watching lecture capture might as well be  
17 added to their personalised timetables outside the face-to-face contact hours. This may offer  
18 them a sense of clarity and structure regarding what they should be doing with the recorded  
19 lectures.  
20  
21

22  
23 For scholars to conduct lecture capture research using online logs, there are implications for  
24 lecture capture technology too. It is misleading that students who merely click on a link are  
25 considered to have accessed a lecture recording (Chapin, 2018). Perhaps, tools such as  
26 Panopto need to track the duration for which students are active and inactive. It could also  
27 capture which parts of the video are viewed once, which parts are viewed repeatedly, and  
28 which parts are skipped altogether. These will constitute useful data for future inquiry.  
29  
30  
31

## 32 33 34 35 *5.2. Recommendations for Future Research*

36  
37 The paper calls for further research to expand the contextual boundaries of the extant lecture  
38 capture literature beyond the US, the UK and Australia. This will help bring the literature more  
39 in line with the present trends of lecture capture usage worldwide, thereby bridging the  
40 literature-practice gap. More studies involving postgraduate students, executive students,  
41 and part-time students will also be helpful, particularly in subject areas that are currently  
42 under-represented in the literature (cf. Figure 4).  
43  
44

45  
46 Where possible, lecture capture research needs to consider the perspectives of both students  
47 and staff in conjunction. This will help paint a more holistic picture and afford a greater degree  
48 of triangulation compared with current works, most of which myopically focus on only  
49 students (cf. Appendix A). For research involving staff, care should be taken to recruit not only  
50 junior academics but also experienced instructors—whose voices are not widely echoed in  
51 the current literature.  
52  
53

54  
55 Research comparing data from multiple institutions is particularly recommended to better  
56 understand how lecture capture is received by a diverse range of students and staff, and  
57 whether any systematic differences exist as a function of contextual factors. For this purpose,  
58 cross-institutional collaborations among academics could be an ideal way forward. Cross-  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 national analysis has also been far and few hitherto. As indicated earlier, only one article  
2 reported a comparative analysis between two countries (Trenholm et al., 2019). Plugging this  
3 research gap may require wider cross-country collaborations among academics. In addition,  
4 works such as Bos et al. (2016) have made their data available under a Creative Commons BY-  
5 ND 3.0 licence. This could also be a step in the right direction in order to foster cross-country  
6 and cross-cultural lecture capture research. All in all, cross-institutional collaborations, cross-  
7 country collaborations, and open data sharing are poised to add a real impetus to the lecture  
8 capture research landscape, without which the question of how culture shapes lecture  
9 capture usage and attitudes will remain unanswered.

10  
11  
12 Moreover, scholars interested to publish empirical works in the field of lecture capture are  
13 urged to provide as much contextual details as realistically possible. Peer-reviewers of  
14 journals too have a crucial role to play as gatekeepers. Since the field is very much sensitive  
15 to contextual factors (Caglayan and Ustunluoglu, in press; Nordmann et al., 2019), lack of  
16 sufficient details thwarts a systematic interpretation of the results. For example, several  
17 articles in the systematic review did not specify the duration of lecture recordings, the  
18 number of lectures or the shape of the academic year (e.g., semester or trimester), and  
19 undergraduate student categorisation by year of study where applicable. Findings cannot be  
20 assumed to be the same regardless of such factors. In fact, these might as well moderate the  
21 relation between lecture capture usage and academic performance as well as that between  
22 lecture capture usage and attendance—a significant omission in the current literature that  
23 warrants scholarly attention.

24  
25  
26 As technology continues to evolve and students keep on adapting, this paper recognises a  
27 need for replication in lecture capture research, especially the quantitative studies with small  
28 sample size. Currently, owing to the relatively limited number of studies with little  
29 methodological consistency—that too with occasionally insufficient contextual details, the  
30 true picture of lecture capture remains blurred. In this vein, both close replication and  
31 differentiated replication could be pursued (Uncles and Kwok, 2013). Close replication  
32 facilitates verifying previous results in almost similar settings. Differentiated replication  
33 allows for variations at conceptual, methodological and/or substantive levels to test the  
34 generalisability of previous results.

35  
36  
37 Such replications should be situated within broader pedagogical theories and frameworks.  
38 This is important because existing works mostly present descriptive and/or exploratory  
39 research fuelled by practical concerns rather than theoretical debates. The literature will be  
40 enriched by an understanding of lecture capture through the lenses of various learning  
41 paradigms such as behaviourism, cognitivism and constructivism (Bichelmeyer and Hsu, 1999;  
42 Ertmer and Newby, 1993; Radianti et al., 2020).

43  
44  
45 Furthermore, the replications should control for all possible contextual factors that the  
46 original studies might have missed out. Even if the replications yield statistically non-  
47 significant results, they should not be treated as theoretically insignificant. Otherwise, the  
48 practice of reporting only significant results will never allow the true picture of lecture capture  
49 to emerge.

1 Given the often-held apprehension that journals are hesitant to publish sole replications,  
2 scholars are encouraged to augment the replicative efforts with additional studies to pass  
3 muster. On the quantitative front, experimental research is encouraged so as to obtain  
4 causative evidence. Big data analyses and computational techniques could be explored too.  
5 If algorithms can predict academic performance from lecture capture usage, it would be a  
6 helpful tool for educators to identify at-risk students on the fly and support them accordingly.  
7

8  
9 On the qualitative front, more in-depth interviews could be conducted. Emerging data  
10 collection approaches such as screencast videography could be employed to better  
11 appreciate students' lived digital experience of viewing lecture recordings (Kawaf, 2019).  
12 Nuances could be teased out between when lecture recordings are watched on laptops versus  
13 mobile devices. Differences between lower-achieving and higher-achieving students as well  
14 as those between frequent attendees and non-frequent attendees are worth investigating.  
15 At the undergraduate level, longitudinal studies—either quantitative or qualitative—will also  
16 be useful to shed light on how students mature from their first year of study to the final year.  
17

18  
19 Furthermore, the paper calls for more lecture capture research involving instructors. Here are  
20 a few possible research questions that are under-explored thus far: To what extent do  
21 instructors utilise lecture capture to reflect on their teaching practices? How does instructors'  
22 teaching performance (e.g., student feedback as proxy variable) with lecture capture differ  
23 from that without lecture capture? In what ways do instructors' use of lecture capture for  
24 teaching purposes evolve over time? How does instructors' lecturing style, personality and  
25 other individual differences affect their teaching performance as well as students' lecture  
26 capture usage? Are there any differences in attitudes toward lecture capture between junior  
27 and senior academics, given that the latter lies relatively more toward the wrong side of the  
28 digital divide? To what extent do instructors' teaching performance and students' lecture  
29 capture usage vary when the technology captures only audio versus both audio and video? In  
30 what ways do instructors' and students' use of lecture capture differ when the technology is  
31 rolled out under regulatory pressure versus when it is embraced voluntarily? By identifying  
32 these research opportunities, the paper hopes to pave the way to reconcile students'  
33 perception of lecture capture, instructors' perception of lecture capture, and the reality of  
34 lecture capture. Table 3 summarises the dominant research trends and the future research  
35 directions in light of the three objectives that this systematic review sought to achieve.  
36  
37

38  
39 Finally, as the COVID-19 pandemic and the social distancing measures continue to accelerate  
40 the push toward online teaching and learning, how instructors and students adapt their use  
41 of lecture capture—both in vitro and in vivo (Pale et al., 2014)—is worth investigating.  
42 Instructors, who were once reluctant to adopt lecture capture, may become more open to  
43 using the technology. Students' attitudes, motivations, and behavioural engagement may also  
44 change in unprecedented ways. To better understand the educational upheaval linked with  
45 the pandemic, pre- versus mid- versus post-COVID-19 comparative studies on lecture capture  
46 are essential. This could be a particularly exciting research direction among scholars who have  
47 already accumulated a wealth of data prior to the COVID-19 outbreak.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

**Table 3:** Current trends and future directions in lecture capture research in higher education.

|  | <b>Dominant Research Trends</b>  | <b>Future Research Directions</b>   |
|--|--|---|
| Objective 1:<br>Contexts                             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Country: US, UK, Australia</li> <li>Sample: Undergraduate students</li> <li>Discipline: Biological Sciences, Business/ Economics/ Management</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research on under-investigated countries, samples and disciplines</li> <li>Comparison of data from multiple institutions</li> <li>Cross-country and cross-cultural study</li> <li>Jointly understanding the views of students and instructors</li> </ul>   |
| Objective 2:<br>Methods                              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mixed methods</li> <li>Surveys and tracking student-specific data</li> <li>Correlational research</li> <li>Exploratory research</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Causative research (e.g., experiments)</li> <li>Big data analyses</li> <li>Interviews and screencast videography</li> <li>Longitudinal study</li> <li>Theory-driven research</li> </ul>  |
| Objective 3:<br>Overarching Steams in the Literature | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Positive association with learning but negative association with attendance</li> <li>Benefits of lecture capture seem to outnumber its drawbacks</li> <li>The assumption among most students is that lecture capture is helpful for learning, and among staff is that it takes a toll on attendance</li> <li>Lecture capture seems to work well if students use it as a supplementary resource—rather than an alternative—to live lectures</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Close and differentiated replication</li> <li>Comparing students watching on laptops versus mobile devices</li> <li>Comparing usage between lower-achieving and higher-achieving students</li> <li>Comparing usage between frequent attendees and non-frequent attendees in face-to-face lectures</li> <li>Research on instructors' personality, lecturing style, and teaching performance with and without lecture capture</li> <li>Comparing junior and senior academics as instructors when using lecture capture</li> <li>Reconciliation of students' perception of lecture capture, instructors' perception of lecture capture, and the reality of lecture capture</li> </ul> |

*Note.* For all future research, scholars are encouraged to provide as much contextual details as possible. Such factors including the likes of duration of lecture recordings, number of lectures recorded, availability of lecture capture, year of study for undergraduate students, availability of captions in the recordings, etc. can even be used as potential moderating variables.

### 5.3. Concluding Remarks

To conclude, while the issues raised by lecture capture are complex, the researcher would like to argue that its benefits (cf. Appendix B) outweigh its drawbacks (cf. Appendix C). Nevertheless, students need to be explicitly told how to make the best use of lecture capture. In addition, instructors need to plan content and delivery in such a way so that either of lecture attendance or lecture capture viewing cannot steal the thunder from each other.

1 That said, the paper invites interested scholars to challenge this argument forwarded by the  
2 researcher. In the wake of the COVID-19 outbreak, if it manages to stir a healthy debate  
3 among the scholarly community regarding the use of lecture capture in universities, it would  
4 have served its purpose.  
5  
6

## 7 **References**

8  
9  
10 The 71 articles marked with an asterisk indicate those included in the systematic literature  
11 review.  
12

13  
14 \* Al Nashash, H., and Gunn, C. (2013). Lecture capture in engineering classes: Bridging gaps  
15 and enhancing learning. *Educational Technology & Society*, 16 (1), 69-78.  
16

17  
18 \* Aldamen, H., Al-Esmail, R., and Hollindale, J. (2015). Does lecture capturing impact student  
19 performance and attendance in an introductory accounting course? *Accounting Education*,  
20 24(4), 291-317.  
21

22  
23 Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., and Razavieh, A. (2002). Introduction to research in education.  
24 Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.  
25

26  
27 Bahnson, J., and Olejnikova, L. (2017). Are recorded lectures better than live lectures for  
28 teaching students legal research? *Law Library Journal*, 109(2), 187-204. [Online]. Available at  
29 <https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/lj109&div=16> [Accessed 22 August  
30 2019].  
31

32  
33 \* Baker, P. R., Demant, D., and Cathcart, A. (2018). Technology in public health higher  
34 education. *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Health*, 30(7), 655-665.  
35

36  
37 Belland, B. R., & Drake, J. (2013). Toward a framework on how affordances and motives can  
38 drive different uses of scaffolds: Theory, evidence, and design implications. *Educational*  
39 *Technology Research and Development*, 61(6), 903-925.  
40

41  
42 Bichelmeyer, B. A., and Hsu, Y. C. (1999). Individually-guided education and problem-based  
43 learning: A comparison of pedagogical approaches from different epistemological views.  
44 [Online]. Available at: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED436135.pdf> [Accessed 6 August  
45 2020].  
46  
47

48  
49 Blessinger, P., Hoffman, J., and Makhanya, M. (2018). Towards a more equal, inclusive  
50 higher education. *University World News*. [Online]. 9 March 2018. Available at  
51 <https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20180306102731111> [Accessed 29  
52 April 2019].  
53

54  
55 \* Bollmeier, S. G., Wenger, P. J., and Forinash, A. B. (2010). Impact of online lecture-capture  
56 on student outcomes in a therapeutics course. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical*  
57 *Education*, 74(7), 127:1-6.  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 \* Bos, N., Groeneveld, C., van Bruggen, J., and Brand-Gruwel, S. (2016). The use of recorded  
2 lectures in education and the impact on lecture attendance and exam performance. *British*  
3 *Journal of Educational Technology*, 47(5), 906-917.

4  
5 \* Brackenbury, W. J. (in press). Relationship between lecture capture usage and  
6 examination performance of undergraduate bioscience students. *Journal of Biological*  
7 *Education*. doi:10.1080/00219266.2019.1707258

8  
9  
10 \* Brady, M., Wong, R., and Newton, G. (2013). Characterization of catch-up behavior:  
11 Accession of lecture capture videos following student absenteeism. *Education Sciences*, 3(3),  
12 344-358.

13  
14  
15 \* Brooks, C., Erickson, G., Greer, J., and Gutwin, C. (2014). Modelling and quantifying the  
16 behaviours of students in lecture capture environments. *Computers & Education*, 75, 282-  
17 292.

18  
19  
20 \* Caglayan, E., and Ustunluoglu, E. (in press). A study exploring students' usage patterns and  
21 adoption of lecture capture. *Technology, Knowledge and Learning*. doi:10.1007/s10758-020-  
22 09435-9

23  
24  
25 \* Chapin, L. A. (2018). Australian university students' access to web-based lecture  
26 recordings and the relationship with lecture attendance and academic performance.  
27 *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 34(5), 1-12.

28  
29  
30 \* Chen, J., and Lin, T. F. (2012). Do supplemental online recorded lectures help students  
31 learn microeconomics? *International Review of Economics Education*, 11(1), 6-15.

32  
33  
34 \* Cooke, M., Watson, B., Blacklock, E., Mansah, M., Howard, M., Johnston, A., ... and  
35 Murfield, J. (2012). Lecture capture: First year student nurses' experiences of a web based  
36 lecture technology. *Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 29(3), 14-21.

37  
38  
39  
40 Clunie, L., Morris, N. P., Joynes, V. C., and Pickering, J. D. (2018). How comprehensive are  
41 research studies investigating the efficacy of technology-enhanced learning resources in  
42 anatomy education? A systematic review. *Anatomical Sciences Education*, 11(3), 303-319.

43  
44  
45 \* Danielson, J., Preast, V., Bender, H., and Hassall, L. (2014). Is the effectiveness of lecture  
46 capture related to teaching approach or content type? *Computers & Education*, 72, 121-131.

47  
48  
49 \* Davis, S., Connolly, A., and Linfield, E. (2009). Lecture capture: Making the most of face-to-  
50 face learning. *Engineering Education*, 4(2), 4-13.

51  
52  
53 \* Dommett, E. J., van Tilburg, W., and Gardner, B. (2019). A case study: Views on the  
54 practice of opting in and out of lecture capture. *Education and Information Technologies*,  
55 24(5), 3075-3090.

1 \* Dommeyer, C. J. (2017). Lecture capturing: Its effects on students' absenteeism,  
2 performance, and impressions in a traditional marketing research course. *Journal of*  
3 *Education for Business*, 92(8), 388-395.

4  
5 \* Dona, K. L., Gregory, J., and Pechenkina, E. (2017). Lecture-recording technology in higher  
6 education: Exploring lecturer and student views across the disciplines. *Australasian Journal*  
7 *of Educational Technology*, 33(4), 122-133.

8  
9  
10 \* Draper, M. J., Gibbon, S., and Thomas, J. (2018). Lecture recording: A new norm. *The Law*  
11 *Teacher*, 52(3), 316-334.

12  
13  
14 \* Drouin, M. A. (2014). If you record it, some won't come: Using lecture capture in  
15 introductory psychology. *Teaching of Psychology*, 41(1), 11-19.

16  
17  
18 \* Ebbert, D., and Dutke, S. (2020). Patterns in students' usage of lecture recordings: A  
19 cluster analysis of self-report data. *Research in Learning Technology*, 28.  
20 doi:10.25304/rlt.v28.2258

21  
22  
23 \* Edwards, M. R., and Clinton, M. E. (2019). A study exploring the impact of lecture capture  
24 availability and lecture capture usage on student attendance and attainment. *Higher*  
25 *Education*, 77(3), 403-421.

26  
27  
28 \* Elliott, C., and Neal, D. (2016). Evaluating the use of lecture capture using a revealed  
29 preference approach. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 17(2), 153-167.

30  
31  
32 Ertmer, P. and Newby, T. (1993). Behaviorism, cognitivism, constructivism: Comparing  
33 critical features from an instructional design perspective. *Performance Improvement*  
34 *Quarterly*, 6(4), 50-71.

35  
36  
37 \* Euzent, P., Martin, T., Moskal, P., and Moskal, P. D. (2011). Assessing student performance  
38 and perceptions in lecture capture vs. face-to-face course delivery. *Journal of Information*  
39 *Technology Education: Research*, 10, 295-307.

40  
41  
42 \* Farooq, M. S., Salam, M., Jaafar, N., Fayolle, A., Ayupp, K., Radovic-Markovic, M., and Sajid,  
43 A. (2017). Acceptance and use of lecture capture system (LCS) in executive business studies:  
44 Extending UTAUT2. *Interactive Technology and Smart Education*, 14(4), 329-348.

45  
46  
47 \* Ford, M. B., Burns, C. E., Mitch, N., and Gomez, M. M. (2012). The effectiveness of  
48 classroom capture technology. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 13(3), 191-201.

49  
50  
51 \* Franklin, D. S., Gibson, J. W., Samuel, J. C., Teeter, W. A., and Clarkson, C. W. (2011). Use of  
52 lecture recordings in medical education. *Medical Science Educator*, 21(1), 21-28.

53  
54  
55 \* Freed, P. E., Bertram, J. E., and McLaughlin, D. E. (2014). Using lecture capture: A  
56 qualitative study of nursing faculty's experience. *Nurse Education Today*, 34(4), 598-602.

1 \* Germany, L. (2012). Beyond lecture capture: What teaching staff want from web-based  
2 lecture technologies. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 28(7), 1208-1220.

3  
4 \* Gorissen, P., van Bruggen, J., and Jochems, W. (2012). Students and recorded lectures:  
5 Survey on current use and demands for higher education. *Research in Learning Technology*,  
6 20, 297-311.

7  
8  
9 \* Gorissen, P., van Bruggen, J., and Jochems, W. (2013). Methodological triangulation of the  
10 students' use of recorded lectures. *International Journal of Learning Technology*, 8(1), 20-40.

11  
12  
13 \* Gorissen, P., van Bruggen, J., and Jochems, W. (2015). Does tagging improve the  
14 navigation of online recorded lectures by students? *British Journal of Educational*  
15 *Technology*, 46(1), 45-57.

16  
17  
18 \* Gosper, M., McNeill, M., Phillips, R., Preston, G., Woo, K., and Green, D. (2010). Web-  
19 based lecture technologies and learning and teaching: A study of change in four Australian  
20 universities. *Research in Learning Technology*, 18(3), 251-263.

21  
22  
23 \* Groen, J. F., Quigley, B., and Herry, Y. (2016). Examining the Use of Lecture Capture  
24 Technology: Implications for Teaching and Learning. *Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of*  
25 *Teaching and Learning*, 7(1). [Online]. Available at  
26 <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1104436.pdf> [Accessed 14 October 2019].

27  
28  
29 \* Gupta, A., and Saks, N. S. (2013). Exploring medical student decisions regarding attending  
30 live lectures and using recorded lectures. *Medical Teacher*, 35(9), 767-771.

31  
32  
33 \* Guy, R., Byrne, B., and Dobos, M. (2018). Optional anatomy and physiology e-learning  
34 resources: student access, learning approaches, and academic outcomes. *Advances in*  
35 *Physiology Education*, 42(1), 43-49.

36  
37  
38 \* Gysbers, V., Johnston, J., Hancock, D., and Denyer, G. (2011). Why do students still bother  
39 coming to lectures, when everything is available online? *International Journal of Innovation*  
40 *in Science and Mathematics Education*, 19(2), 20-36.

41  
42  
43 \* Hadgu, R. M., Huynh, S., and Gopalan, C. (2016). The Use of Lecture Capture and Student  
44 Performance in Physiology. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching*, 5(1), 11-18.

45  
46  
47 \* Hall, G., and Ivaldi, A. (2017). A qualitative approach to understanding the role of lecture  
48 capture in student learning experiences. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 26(4), 383-  
49 394.

50  
51  
52 \* Hussain, A., Tabrez, E., Basu, A., and D'Silva, C. S. (2018). Medical students' perception of  
53 the usage of lecture recording software. *Cureus*, 10(7). [Online]. Available at  
54 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6135296/> [Accessed 3 September 2019].

55  
56  
57  
58 Ibrahim, Y., Howarth, A., & Stone, I. (in press). Lecture capture policies: A survey of British  
59 universities. *Postdigital Science and Education*. doi:10.1007/s42438-020-00102-x  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1 \* Jones, C., and Olczak, M. (2016). The impact of lecture capture on student performance.  
2 *Australasian Journal of Economics Education*, 13(1), 13-29.  
3

4  
5 \* Joseph-Richard, P., Jessop, T., Okafor, G., Almpanis, T., & Price, D. (2018). Big brother or  
6 harbinger of best practice: Can lecture capture actually improve teaching? *British*  
7 *Educational Research Journal*, 44(3), 377-392.  
8

9  
10 Kay, R. H. (2012). Exploring the use of video podcasts in education: A comprehensive review  
11 of the literature. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 28(3), 820-831.  
12

13 Kawaf, F. (2019). Capturing digital experience: The method of screencast videography.  
14 *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 36(2), 169-184.  
15

16  
17  
18 Kerr, N. L. (1998). HARKing: Hypothesizing after the results are known. *Personality and*  
19 *Social Psychology Review*, 2(3), 196-217.  
20

21 \* Khan, H. U. (2016). Possible effect of video lecture capture technology on the cognitive  
22 Empowerment of higher education students: A case study of gulf-based university.  
23 *International Journal of Innovation and Learning*, 20(1), 68-84.  
24

25  
26  
27 Kirschner, P. A., Strijbos, J., Kreijns, K., and Beers, P. (2004). Designing electronic  
28 collaborative learning environments. *Educational Technology Research and Development*,  
29 52(3), 47-66.  
30

31  
32 \* Krautscheid, L., Williams, S., Kahn, B., and Adams, K. (in press). Untethered lecture  
33 capture: A qualitative investigation of college student experiences. *Journal of Educational*  
34 *Technology Systems*. doi:10.1177/0047239519833690  
35

36  
37 \* Lambert, S., Pond, K., and Witthaus, G. (in press). Making a difference with lecture  
38 capture? Providing evidence for research-informed policy. *The International Journal of*  
39 *Management Education*, 17(3). doi:10.1016/j.ijme.2019.100323  
40

41  
42 \* Leadbeater, W., Shuttleworth, T., Couperthwaite, J., and Nightingale, K. P. (2013).  
43 Evaluating the use and impact of lecture recording in undergraduates: Evidence for distinct  
44 approaches by different groups of students. *Computers & Education*, 61, 185-192.  
45

46  
47 Loch, B., Jordan, C. R., Lowe, T. W., and Mestel, B. D. (2014). Do screencasts help to revise  
48 prerequisite mathematics? An investigation of student performance and perception.  
49 *International Journal of Mathematical Education in Science and Technology*, 45(2), 256-268.  
50

51  
52 \* Luttenberger, S., Macher, D., Maidl, V., Rominger, C., Aydin, N., and Paechter, M. (2018).  
53 Different patterns of university students' integration of lecture podcasts, learning materials,  
54 and lecture attendance in a psychology course. *Education and Information Technologies*,  
55 23(1), 165-178.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 \* MacKay, J. R. (in press). Show and 'tool': How lecture recording transforms staff and  
2 student perspectives on lectures in higher education. *Computers & Education*.  
3 doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2019.05.019  
4

5 Maflahi, N., and Thelwall, M. (2016). When are readership counts as useful as citation  
6 counts? Scopus versus Mendeley for LIS journals. *Journal of the Association for Information  
7 Science and Technology*, 67(1), 191-199.  
8

9  
10 \* Mallinson, D. J., and Baumann, Z. D. (2015). Lights, camera, learn: understanding the role  
11 of lecture capture in undergraduate education. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 48(3), 478-  
12 482.  
13

14  
15 \* Marchand, J. P., Pearson, M. L., and Albon, S. P. (2014). Student and faculty member  
16 perspectives on lecture capture in pharmacy education. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical  
17 Education*, 78(4), 74:1-7.  
18

19  
20 \* McCunn, P., and Newton, G. (2015). Student perception of topic difficulty: Lecture capture  
21 in higher education. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 31(3), 252-262.  
22

23  
24 \* McLean, J. L., and Suchman, E. L. (2016). Video lecture capture technology helps students  
25 study without affecting attendance in large microbiology lecture courses. *Journal of  
26 Microbiology & Biology Education*, 17(3), 480-481.  
27

28  
29 \* Nair, P. K., Ali, F., and Leong, L. C. (2015). Factors affecting acceptance & use of ReWIND:  
30 Validating the extended unified theory of acceptance and use of technology. *Interactive  
31 Technology and Smart Education*, 12(3), 183-201.  
32

33  
34  
35 Newland, B. (2017). Lecture capture in UK HE 2017: A HeLF survey report. [Online]. Available  
36 at: [https://cris.brighton.ac.uk/ws/portalfiles/portal/483569/HeLF\\_Lecture\\_Capture\\_2017.pdf](https://cris.brighton.ac.uk/ws/portalfiles/portal/483569/HeLF_Lecture_Capture_2017.pdf)  
37 (Accessed 5 August 2020).  
38

39  
40 Newton, G., Tucker, T., Dawson, J., and Currie, E. (2014). Use of lecture capture in higher  
41 education-lessons from the trenches. *TechTrends*, 58(2), 32-45.  
42

43  
44 \* Nightingale, K. P., Anderson, V., Onens, S., Fazil, Q., and Davies, H. (2019). Developing the  
45 inclusive curriculum: Is supplementary lecture recording an effective approach in supporting  
46 students with Specific Learning Difficulties (SpLDs)? *Computers & Education*, 130, 13-25.  
47

48  
49 \* Nordmann, E., Calder, C., Bishop, P., Irwin, A., and Comber, D. (2019). Turn up, tune in,  
50 don't drop out: The relationship between lecture attendance, use of lecture recordings, and  
51 achievement at different levels of study. *Higher Education*, 77(6), 1065-1084.  
52

53  
54 \* O'Brien, M., and Verma, R. (2019). How do first year students utilize different lecture  
55 resources? *Higher Education*, 77(1), 155-172.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 O'Callaghan, F. V., Neumann, D. L., Jones, L., and Creed, P. A. (2017). The use of lecture  
2 recordings in higher education: A review of institutional, student, and lecturer issues.  
3 *Education and Information Technologies*, 22(1), 399-415.

4  
5 \* Owston, R., Lupshenyuk, D., and Wideman, H. (2011). Lecture capture in large  
6 undergraduate classes: Student perceptions and academic performance. *The Internet and*  
7 *Higher Education*, 14(4), 262-268.

8  
9  
10 Pal, A., and Chua, A. (2016). Reviewing the landscape of research on the threats to the  
11 quality of user-generated content. Proceedings of the Association for Information Science  
12 and Technology Conference (pp. 1-9). ASIS&T.

13  
14  
15 Pale, P., Petrović, J., & Jeren, B. (2014). Assessing the learning potential and students'  
16 perception of rich lecture captures. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 30(2), 187-195.

17  
18  
19 Panopto. (2020). 75 studies reveal the impact of lecture capture. [Online]. Available at:  
20 <https://www.panopto.com/blog/75-studies-reveal-the-impact-of-lecture-capture/>  
21 [Accessed 5 August 2020].

22  
23  
24 Radianti, J., Majchrzak, T. A., Fromm, J., and Wohlgenannt, I. (2020). A systematic review of  
25 immersive virtual reality applications for higher education: Design elements, lessons  
26 learned, and research agenda. *Computers & Education*, 147, 103778.

27  
28  
29 \* Rahman, A., Shah, M. A. R., and Chowdhury, S. H. (2018). Lecture capture use in  
30 engineering education: Influence of students' social and behavioral factors and teachers'  
31 perceptions. *Computer Applications in Engineering Education*, 26(3), 500-508.

32  
33  
34 \* Sarsfield, M., and Conway, J. (2018). What can we learn from learning analytics? A case  
35 study based on an analysis of student use of video recordings. *Research in Learning*  
36 *Technology*, 26. [Online]. Available at  
37 <https://journal.alt.ac.uk/index.php/rlt/article/view/2087> [Accessed 20 September 2019].

38  
39  
40 \* Saunders, F. C., and Hutt, I. (2015). Enhancing large-class teaching: A systematic  
41 comparison of rich-media materials. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 34(6),  
42 1233-1250.

43  
44  
45 [Scardamalia, M., and Bereiter, C. \(2010\). A brief history of knowledge building. Canadian](#)  
46 [Journal of Learning and Technology](#), 36(1). Retrieved from  
47 <https://www.learntechlib.org/p/43123/>  
48

49  
50  
51 \* Shaw, G. P., and Molnar, D. (2011). Non-native English language speakers benefit most  
52 from the use of lecture capture in medical school. *Biochemistry and Molecular Biology*  
53 *Education*, 39(6), 416-420.

54  
55  
56 \* Sloan, T. W., and Lewis, D. A. (2014). Lecture capture technology and student performance  
57 in an operations management course. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education*,  
58 12(4), 339-355.

59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 Stokel-Walker, C. (2019, December 4). 'The Netflixisation of academia': Is this the end for  
2 university lectures?, The Guardian. Retrieved from  
3 [https://www.theguardian.com/education/2019/dec/04/the-netflixisation-of-academia-is-](https://www.theguardian.com/education/2019/dec/04/the-netflixisation-of-academia-is-this-the-end-for-university-lectures)  
4 [this-the-end-for-university-lectures](https://www.theguardian.com/education/2019/dec/04/the-netflixisation-of-academia-is-this-the-end-for-university-lectures)  
5  
6

7 \* Taplin, R. H., Low, L. H., and Brown, A. M. (2011). Students' satisfaction and valuation of  
8 web-based lecture recording technologies. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*,  
9 27(2), 175-191.  
10  
11

12 \* Terry, N., Macy, A., Clark, R., and Sanders, G. (2015). The Impact of Lecture Capture on  
13 Student Performance in Business Courses. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*, 12(1), 65-  
14 74.  
15  
16

17 Thomas, L., and May, H. (2010). Inclusive learning and teaching in higher education. *The*  
18 *Higher Education Academy*. [Online]. Available at  
19 [https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/inclusivelearningandteaching\\_finalreport.pdf](https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/inclusivelearningandteaching_finalreport.pdf)  
20 [Accessed 29 April 2019].  
21  
22

23 \* Traphagan, T., Kucsera, J. V., and Kishi, K. (2010). Impact of class lecture webcasting on  
24 attendance and learning. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 58(1), 19-37.  
25  
26

27 \* Trenholm, S., Hajek, B., Robinson, C. L., Chinnappan, M., Albrecht, A., and Ashman, H.  
28 (2019). Investigating undergraduate mathematics learners' cognitive engagement with  
29 recorded lecture videos. *International Journal of Mathematical Education in Science and*  
30 *Technology*, 50(1), 3-24.  
31  
32  
33

34 Uncles, M. D., and Kwok, S. (2013). Designing research with in-built differentiated  
35 replication. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(9), 1398–1405.  
36  
37

38 United Nations. (2015). Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable  
39 development. [Online]. Available at  
40 <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015/transformingourworld> [Accessed 15 May  
41 2020].  
42  
43  
44

45 Valor Miró, J. D., Spencer, R. N., Pérez González de Martos, A., Garcés Díaz-Munío, G., Turró,  
46 C. I. V. E. R. A., Civera, J., and Juan, A. (2014). Evaluating intelligent interfaces for post-  
47 editing automatic transcriptions of online video lectures. *Open Learning: The Journal of*  
48 *Open, Distance and e-Learning*, 29(1), 72-85.  
49  
50

51 \* von Kinsky, B. R., Ivins, J., and Gribble, S. J. (2009). Lecture attendance and web based  
52 lecture technologies: A comparison of student perceptions and usage patterns. *Australasian*  
53 *Journal of Educational Technology*, 25(4), 581-595.  
54  
55

56 Warren, R. (2001). In words and deeds: Parental involvement and mediation of children's  
57 television viewing. *Journal of Family Communication*, 1(4), 211–231.  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 \* Wiese, C., and Newton, G. (2013). Use of lecture capture in undergraduate biological  
2 science education. *Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 4(2).  
3 [Online]. Available at <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1016638.pdf> [Accessed 30  
4 September 2019].  
5

6 \* Williams, A., Birch, E., and Hancock, P. (2012). The impact of online lecture recordings on  
7 student performance. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 28(2), 199-213.  
8

9 \* Williams, A. E., Aguilar-Roca, N. M., and O'Dowd, D. K. (2016). Lecture capture podcasts:  
10 differential student use and performance in a large introductory course. *Educational*  
11 *Technology Research and Development*, 64(1), 1-12.  
12  
13

14 \* Yeung, A., Raju, S., and Sharma, M. D. (2016). Online lecture recordings and lecture  
15 attendance: Investigating student preferences in a large first year psychology course.  
16 *Journal of Learning Design*, 9(1), 55-71.  
17  
18

19 Yli-Huumo, J., Ko, D., Choi, S., Park, S., and Smolander, K. (2016). Where is current research  
20 on blockchain technology?—a systematic review. *PloS One*, 11(10).  
21 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0163477.  
22  
23

24 \* Yu, P. T., Wang, B. Y., and Su, M. H. (2015). Lecture capture with real-time rearrangement  
25 of visual elements: Impact on student performance. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*,  
26 31(6), 655-670.  
27  
28

29 Yukhymenko, M. (2011). Students' interest in social studies and negotiation self-efficacy: A  
30 meta-analysis of the GlobalEd project. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 19(3),  
31 369-392.  
32  
33

34 Zandona, A. F., Kinney, J., Seong, W., Kumar, V., Bendayan, A., and Hewlett, E. (2016).  
35 Should lecture recordings be mandated in Dental Schools? Two viewpoints. *Journal of*  
36 *Dental Education*, 80(12), 1468-1473.  
37  
38

39 Zhang, Y., Sun, Y., and Xie, B. (2015). Quality of health information for consumers on the  
40 web: A systematic review of indicators, criteria, tools, and evaluation results. *Journal of the*  
41 *Association for Information Science and Technology*, 66(10), 2071-2084.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Appendix A

Table A.1: Lecture capture research contexts and research methods.

| Article                            | Site of Research    | Sample          |                     | Academic Discipline               |            | Methodology |   |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|-------------|---|
|                                    |                     | Student / Staff | UG/PG Student       | General Subject Area              | STEM (= 1) | Qual/Quant  | Data (Size if available)                              |
| Al Nashash and Gunn, 2013          | UAE                 | Student         | Not specified       | Engineering                       | 1          | Mixed       | Survey (38) + FGD (4) + Tracking student data (40)    |
| Aldamen et al., 2015               | Qatar               | Student         | UG                  | Business / Economics / Management | 0          | Quant       | Survey (254) + Tracking student data (254)            |
| Baker et al., 2018                 | Australia           | Student         | PG                  | Biological Sciences               | 1          | Quant       | Survey (88) + Tracking student data (453)             |
| Bollmeier et al., 2010             | US                  | Student         | UG                  | Biological Sciences               | 1          | Quant       | Survey (122) + Tracking student data                  |
| Bos et al., 2016                   | Netherlands         | Student         | UG                  | Biological Sciences               | 1          | Quant       | Tracking student data (396)                           |
| Brackenbury, in press              | UK                  | Student         | UG                  | Biological Sciences               | 1          | Quant       | Tracking student data (763)                           |
| Brady et al., 2013                 | Canada              | Student         | UG                  | Biological Sciences               | 1          | Quant       | Survey (77) + Tracking student data                   |
| Brooks et al., 2014                | Canada <sup>3</sup> | Student         | UG                  | Sciences                          | 1          | Quant       | Tracking student data (1,379)                         |
| Caglayan and Ustunluoglu, in press | Turkey              | Student         | UG + PG + Associate | Mixed                             | N/A        | Quant       | Tracking student data (7,547)                         |
| Chapin, 2018                       | Australia           | Student         | UG                  | Biological Sciences               | 1          | Mixed       | Survey (71)   |
| Chen and Lin, 2012                 | Taiwan              | Student         | UG                  | Business / Economics / Management | 0          | Quant       | Survey (312) + Tracking student data (312)            |
| Cooke et al., 2012                 | Australia           | Student         | UG                  | Biological Sciences               | 1          | Quant       | Survey (128)  |
| Danielson et al., 2014             | US                  | Both            | UG                  | Biological Sciences               | 1          | Mixed       | FGD (23) + Survey (257) + Tracking student data (491) |

| Article                            | Site of Research | Sample          |               | Academic Discipline               |            | Methodology |  |
|------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|------------|-------------|--|
|                                    |                  | Student / Staff | UG/PG Student | General Subject Area              | STEM (= 1) | Qual/Quant  | Data (Size if available)                       |
| Davis et al., 2009                 | UK               | Student         | UG            | Engineering                       | 1          | Mixed       | Survey (120) + FGD (5)                         |
| Dommett et al., 2019 <sup>1</sup>  | UK               | Both            | UG + PG       | Mixed                             | N/A        | Mixed       | Survey (617) + FGD (25)                        |
| Dommeyer, 2017                     | US <sup>3</sup>  | Student         | UG            | Business / Economics / Management | 0          | Quant       | Experiment (84)                                |
| Dona et al., 2017                  | Australia        | Both            | UG + PG       | Mixed                             | N/A        | Mixed       | Survey (119) + Interview (119)                 |
| Draper et al., 2018                | UK               | Both            | UG            | Law                               | 0          | Mixed       | Survey (60) + Tracking student data (60)       |
| Drouin, 2014                       | US               | Student         | UG            | Biological Sciences               | 1          | Quant       | Experiment (141) + Tracking student data (141) |
| Ebbert and Dutke, 2020             | Germany          | Student         | Not specified | Mixed                             | N/A        | Quant       | Survey (1,079)                                 |
| Edwards and Clinton, 2019          | UK               | Student         | UG            | Business / Economics / Management | 0          | Quant       | Experiment (321)                               |
| Elliot and Neal, 2016              | UK               | Student         | UG            | Business / Economics / Management | 0          | Mixed       | Tracking student data (1439)+ Survey (216)     |
| Euzent et al., 2011                | US               | Student         | UG            | Business / Economics / Management | 0          | Quant       | Survey + Tracking student data                 |
| Farooq et al., 2017 <sup>1</sup>   | Malaysia         | Student         | Executive     | Business / Economics / Management | 0          | Quant       | Survey (481)                                   |
| Ford et al., 2012                  | US               | Student         | UG            | Biological Sciences               | 1          | Quant       | Experiment (119)                               |
| Franklin et al., 2011              | US               | Student         | UG            | Biological Sciences               | 1          | Quant       | Survey (206) + Tracking student data (206)     |
| Freed et al., 2014                 | US               | Staff           | N/A           | Biological Sciences               | 1          | Qual        | FGD (14)                                       |
| Germany, 2012                      | Australia        | Staff           | N/A           | Mixed                             | N/A        | Mixed       | FGD (10) + Survey (96)                         |
| Gorissen et al., 2012 <sup>1</sup> | Netherlands      | Student         | UG            | Biological Sciences               | 1          | Mixed       | Survey (517) + Interview (14)                  |

| Article                            | Site of Research       | Sample          |               | Academic Discipline               |            | Methodology |  |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|------------|-------------|--|
|                                    |                        | Student / Staff | UG/PG Student | General Subject Area              | STEM (= 1) | Qual/Quant  | Data (Size if available)   |
| Gorissen et al., 2013 <sup>1</sup> | Netherlands            | Student         | Not specified | Mixed                             | N/A        | Mixed       | Survey (120) + Interview (14)+ Tracking student data                   |
| Gorissen et al., 2015              | Netherlands            | Student         | Not specified | Engineering                       | 1          | Quant       | Experiment (255) + Tracking student data (255)                         |
| Gosper et al., 2010 <sup>1</sup>   | Australia              | Both            | UG + PG       | Mixed                             | N/A        | Mixed       | Survey (970) + Interview (16)  |
| Groen et al., 2016                 | Canada                 | Both            | Not specified | Mixed                             | N/A        | Mixed       | Survey (1145) + Interview (6) + FGD (11) + Tracking student data (775) |
| Gupta and Saks, 2013               | US                     | Student         | UG            | Biological Sciences               | 1          | Mixed       | Survey (213)   |
| Guy et al., 2018                   | Australia <sup>3</sup> | Student         | UG            | Biological Sciences               | 1          | Quant       | Survey (137)+ Tracking student data (137)                              |
| Gysbers et al., 2011               | Australia              | Both            | UG            | Biological Sciences               | 1          | Mixed       | Survey (593)   |
| Hadgu et al., 2016                 | US                     | Student         | UG            | Biological Sciences               | 1          | Quant       | Tracking student data (63)   |
| Hall and Ivaldi, 2017              | UK                     | Student         | UG            | Mixed                             | N/A        | Qual        | FGD (42)   |
| Hussain et al., 2018               | UK                     | Student         | Not specified | Biological Sciences               | 1          | Quant       | Survey (105)   |
| Jones and Olczak, 2016             | UK                     | Student         | UG            | Business / Economics / Management | 0          | Quant       | Tracking student data (380)  |
| Joseph-Richard et al., 2018        | UK                     | Staff           | N/A           | Mixed                             | N/A        | Mixed       | Survey (46) + Interview (12)   |
| Khan, 2016                         | Qatar                  | Student         | UG            | Business / Economics / Management | 0          | Mixed       | Survey (97) + Tracking student data (124)                              |
| Krautscheid et al., in press       | US                     | Student         | UG            | Mixed                             | N/A        | Qual        | FGD (23)   |



| Article                               | Site of Research       | Sample          |               | Academic Discipline               |            | Methodology |   |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|------------|-------------|---|
|                                       |                        | Student / Staff | UG/PG Student | General Subject Area              | STEM (= 1) | Qual/Quant  | Data (Size if available)                        |
| Lambert et al., in press              | UK                     | Student         | UG            | Business / Economics / Management | 0          | Mixed       | Survey (64) + Tracking student data (64)        |
| Leadbeater et al., 2013               | UK                     | Student         | UG            | Biological Sciences               | 1          | Mixed       | Survey (140) + Tracking student data + FGD (10) |
| Luttenberger et al., 2018             | Austria <sup>3</sup>   | Student         | Not specified | Education                         | 0          | Quant       | Survey (611)                                    |
| Mackay, in press                      | UK                     | Both            | UG            | Mixed                             | N/A        | Qual        | Interview (13) + Survey (295) + FGD (2)         |
| Mallinson and Baumann, 2015           | US                     | Student         | UG            | Political Science                 | 0          | Mixed       | Survey (320) + Tracking student data (320)      |
| Marchand et al., 2014                 | Canada                 | Both            | UG            | Biological Sciences               | 1          | Mixed       | Survey (273) + Tracking student data            |
| McCunn and Newton, 2015               | Canada                 | Student         | UG            | Biological Sciences               | 1          | Quant       | Survey (87) + Tracking student data (87)        |
| McLean and Suchman, 2016              | US                     | Student         | UG            | Biological Sciences               | 1          | Quant       | Experiment + Tracking student data (1,014)      |
| Nair et al., 2015                     | Malaysia               | Student         | UG            | Mixed                             | N/A        | Quant       | Survey (398)                                    |
| Nightingale et al., 2019 <sup>1</sup> | UK                     | Student         | UG            | Biological Sciences               | 1          | Mixed       | Experiment (92) + FGD (92)                      |
| Nordmann et al., 2019                 | UK                     | Student         | UG            | Biological Sciences               | 1          | Quant       | Tracking student data (290)                     |
| O'Brien and Verma, 2019               | Australia <sup>3</sup> | Student         | UG            | Business / Economics / Management | 0          | Quant       | Tracking student data (1,169)                   |
| Owston et al., 2011                   | Canada                 | Student         | UG            | Biological Sciences               | 1          | Quant       | Survey (439)                                    |
| Rahman et al., 2018                   | Australia              | Both            | UG            | Engineering                       | 1          | Mixed       | Survey (105) + Tracking student data            |
| Sarsfield and Conway, 2018            | UK                     | Student         | UG            | Sciences                          | 1          | Quant       | Tracking student data                           |

| Article                              | Site of Research | Sample          |               | Academic Discipline               |            | Methodology |  |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|------------|-------------|--|
|                                      |                  | Student / Staff | UG/PG Student | General Subject Area              | STEM (= 1) | Qual/Quant  | Data (Size if available)                   |
| Saunders and Hunt, 2015              | UK               | Student         | PG            | Business / Economics / Management | 0          | Mixed       | Survey (84) + FGD (15)                     |
| Shaw and Molnar, 2011                | US               | Student         | UG            | Biological Sciences               | 1          | Quant       | Experiment (113)                           |
| Sloan and Lewis, 2014                | US               | Student         | UG            | Business / Economics / Management | 0          | Quant       | Tracking student data (70)                 |
| Taplin et al., 2011                  | Australia        | Student         | UG + PG       | Business / Economics / Management | 0          | Mixed       | Survey (211)                               |
| Terry et al., 2015                   | US               | Student         | UG            | Business / Economics / Management | 0          | Quant       | Tracking student data (890)                |
| Traphagan et al., 2010               | US               | Student         | UG            | Geology                           | 1          | Mixed       | Experiment (364) + Tracking student data   |
| Trenholm et al., 2019 <sup>1,2</sup> | UK, Australia    | Student         | UG            | Mathematics                       | 1          | Quant       | Experiment (93)                            |
| von Konsky et al., 2009              | Australia        | Student         | UG            | Computer / Information Science    | 1          | Quant       | Survey (108) + Tracking student data (108) |
| Wiese and Newton, 2013               | Canada           | Student         | UG            | Biological Sciences               | 1          | Quant       | Survey (308)+ Tracking student data (597)  |
| Williams et al., 2012                | Australia        | Student         | UG            | Business / Economics / Management | 0          | Quant       | Survey (371) + Tracking student data (371) |
| Williams et al., 2016                | US               | Student         | UG            | Biological Sciences               | 1          | Quant       | Tracking student data (835)                |
| Yeung et al., 2016                   | Australia        | Student         | UG            | Biological Sciences               | 1          | Mixed       | Survey (1,022)                             |
| Yu et al., 2015                      | Taiwan           | Student         | UG            | Computer / Information Science    | 1          | Quant       | Experiment (302)                           |

Notes. 1 = More than one institute involved.

2 = More than one country involved.

3 = Site not explicitly specified but inferred from the author(s)' affiliation.

FGD = Focus group discussion.

STEM = Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics Subject.

The last column indicates the number of data points within parentheses for each data source, provided it was clearly indicated.



| Article                               | Facilitates learning &/or revision | Positively impacts academic performance | Allows a better work-life balance | Helps fill in lecture notes | Aids revisiting difficult concepts | Helps overcome language barriers | Enhances student interest in lectures | Supports students with disabilities | Reduces anxiety among students | Improves the quality of teaching |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Franklin et al., 2011 <sup>1</sup>    |                                    | x                                       | x                                 | x                           | x                                  |                                  |                                       |                                     | x                              |                                  |
| Gorissen et al., 2012 <sup>1</sup>    | x                                  | x                                       | x                                 | x                           |                                    | x                                |                                       |                                     |                                |                                  |
| Gorissen et al., 2013                 | x                                  | x                                       | x                                 | x                           |                                    | x                                | x                                     |                                     |                                |                                  |
| Gorissen et al., 2015                 | x                                  | x                                       |                                   | x                           |                                    |                                  |                                       |                                     |                                |                                  |
| Gosper et al., 2010                   | x                                  | x                                       | x                                 | x                           | x                                  | x                                |                                       | x                                   |                                |                                  |
| Groen et al., 2016                    | x                                  | x                                       | x                                 | x                           | x                                  | x                                |                                       |                                     | x                              |                                  |
| Gupta and Saks, 2013 <sup>1</sup>     | x                                  | x                                       | x                                 |                             | x                                  |                                  |                                       |                                     |                                |                                  |
| Guy et al., 2018 <sup>1</sup>         |                                    | x                                       |                                   |                             |                                    |                                  |                                       |                                     |                                |                                  |
| Gysbers et al., 2011 <sup>1</sup>     | x                                  |   | x                                 | x                           | x                                  | x                                |                                       |                                     |                                | x                                |
| Hall and Ivaldi, 2017                 | x                                  |   | x                                 | x                           |                                    | x                                |                                       | x                                   |                                |                                  |
| Hussain et al., 2018 <sup>1</sup>     | x                                  | x                                       | x                                 | x                           | x                                  |                                  |                                       |                                     |                                |                                  |
| Jones and Olczak, 2016 <sup>2</sup>   | x                                  | x                                       |                                   |                             |                                    |                                  |                                       |                                     |                                |                                  |
| Joseph-Richard et al., 2018           |                                    |   |                                   |                             |                                    |                                  |                                       |                                     |                                | x                                |
| Krautscheid et al., in press          | x                                  | x                                       |                                   | x                           |                                    |                                  | x                                     | x                                   |                                |                                  |
| Lambert et al., in press <sup>2</sup> | x                                  | x                                       | x                                 | x                           |                                    | x                                | x                                     | x                                   |                                |                                  |

| Article                               | Facilitates learning &/or revision | Positively impacts academic performance | Allows a better work-life balance | Helps fill in lecture notes | Aids revisiting difficult concepts | Helps overcome language barriers | Enhances student interest in lectures | Supports students with disabilities | Reduces anxiety among students | Improves the quality of teaching |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Leadbeater et al., 2013 <sup>1</sup>  |                                    |   | x                                 | x                           | x                                  | x                                |                                       | x                                   |                                |                                  |
| Luttenberger et al., 2018             |                                    | x                                       |                                   |                             |                                    |                                  |                                       |                                     |                                |                                  |
| MacKay, in press                      | x                                  |   | x                                 |                             | x                                  |                                  | x                                     | x                                   |                                |                                  |
| Mallinson and Baumann, 2015           | x                                  |   | x                                 |                             | x                                  | x                                |                                       |                                     |                                |                                  |
| Marchand et al., 2014 <sup>1</sup>    | x                                  | x                                       | x                                 | x                           | x                                  |                                  | x                                     |                                     |                                |                                  |
| McCunn and Newton, 2015 <sup>1</sup>  |                                    |   |                                   |                             | x                                  |                                  |                                       |                                     |                                |                                  |
| McLean and Suchman, 2016 <sup>1</sup> | x                                  |   |                                   | x                           |                                    |                                  |                                       |                                     | x                              |                                  |
| Nightingale et al., 2019 <sup>1</sup> | x                                  |   |                                   | x                           |                                    |                                  | x                                     | x                                   |                                |                                  |
| Nordmann et al., 2019 <sup>1</sup>    |                                    | x                                       |                                   |                             |                                    |                                  |                                       |                                     |                                |                                  |
| O'Brien and Verma, 2019 <sup>2</sup>  |                                    |   | x                                 |                             |                                    |                                  |                                       |                                     |                                |                                  |
| Owston et al., 2011 <sup>1</sup>      | x                                  |   |                                   |                             |                                    |                                  |                                       |                                     |                                |                                  |
| Rahman et al., 2018                   | x                                  | x                                       | x                                 |                             | x                                  | x                                |                                       |                                     |                                | x                                |
| Saunders and Hunt, 2015 <sup>2</sup>  | x                                  |   | x                                 |                             |                                    | x                                |                                       |                                     |                                |                                  |
| Shaw and Molnar, 2011 <sup>1</sup>    |                                    | x                                       |                                   |                             |                                    | x                                |                                       |                                     |                                |                                  |

| Article                             | Facilitates learning &/or revision | Positively impacts academic performance | Allows a better work-life balance | Helps fill in lecture notes | Aids revisiting difficult concepts | Helps overcome language barriers | Enhances student interest in lectures | Supports students with disabilities | Reduces anxiety among students | Improves the quality of teaching |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Sloan and Lewis, 2014 <sup>2</sup>  |                                    | x                                       |                                   |                             |                                    |                                  |                                       |                                     |                                |                                  |
| Taplin et al., 2011 <sup>2</sup>    | x                                  | x                                       |                                   |                             |                                    |                                  |                                       |                                     |                                |                                  |
| Terry et al., 2015 <sup>2</sup>     |                                    |   |                                   |                             |                                    |                                  |                                       |                                     |                                |                                  |
| Traphagan et al., 2010              | x                                  | x                                       | x                                 |                             |                                    |                                  |                                       |                                     | x                              |                                  |
| von Kinsky et al., 2009             | x                                  |   |                                   |                             |                                    |                                  |                                       |                                     |                                |                                  |
| Wiese and Newton, 2013 <sup>1</sup> | x                                  | x                                       |                                   |                             |                                    |                                  |                                       |                                     |                                |                                  |
| Williams et al., 2012               |                                    | x                                       |                                   |                             |                                    |                                  |                                       |                                     |                                |                                  |
| Williams et al., 2016 <sup>1</sup>  | x                                  | x                                       | x                                 |                             |                                    | x                                |                                       |                                     |                                |                                  |
| Yeung et al., 2016 <sup>1</sup>     | x                                  | x                                       | x                                 | x                           | x                                  | x                                |                                       |                                     |                                |                                  |
| Yu et al., 2015                     | x                                  | x                                       |                                   |                             |                                    |                                  |                                       |                                     |                                |                                  |
| <b>Total</b>                        | <b>41</b>                          | <b>39</b>                               | <b>31</b>                         | <b>21</b>                   | <b>19</b>                          | <b>17</b>                        | <b>10</b>                             | <b>8</b>                            | <b>5</b>                       | <b>3</b>                         |

Notes. 1 = Biological Sciences, the most widely studied STEM subject area.

2 = Business/ Economics / Management, the most widely studied non-STEM subject area.

## Appendix C

Table C.1: Drawbacks of lecture capture in higher education.

| Article                                | Adverse impact on lecture attendance | Tackling technical difficulties | Students' reluctance to watch | Attenuates instructor-student interaction | Encourages surface learning &/or procrastination | Instructors' discomfort &/or self-consciousness |
|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Al Nashash and Gunn, 2013              |                                      | x                               | x                             |   |  |   |
| Aldamen et al., 2015 <sup>2</sup>      | x                                    |                                 |                               |   |  |   |
| Bos et al., 2016 <sup>1</sup>          | x                                    |                                 |                               |   |  |   |
| Brady et al., 2013 <sup>1</sup>        |                                      |                                 | x                             |   |  |   |
| Chapin, 2018 <sup>1</sup>              |                                      | x                               | x                             |   |  |   |
| Cooke et al., 2012 <sup>1</sup>        |                                      | x                               |                               | x   |  |   |
| Danielson et al., 2014 <sup>1</sup>    | x                                    |                                 |                               | x   |  | x   |
| Davis et al., 2009                     | x                                    | x                               | x                             |   |  |   |
| Dommett et al., 2019                   |                                      |                                 |                               |   |  | x   |
| Dommeier, 2017 <sup>2</sup>            |                                      | x                               |                               | x   |  |   |
| Dona et al., 2017                      | x                                    | x                               | x                             | x   | x  | x   |
| Drouin, 2014 <sup>1</sup>              | x                                    |                                 |                               |   |  |   |
| Ebbert and Dutke, 2020                 | x                                    |                                 |                               |   |  |   |
| Edwards and Clinton, 2019 <sup>2</sup> | x                                    |                                 |                               |   | x  |   |
| Elliot and Neal, 2016 <sup>2</sup>     |                                      | x                               |                               |   |  |   |
| Euzent et al., 2011 <sup>2</sup>       | x                                    |                                 |                               |   |  |   |
| Farooq et al., 2017 <sup>2</sup>       |                                      | x                               |                               |   |  |   |
| Franklin et al., 2011 <sup>1</sup>     |                                      | x                               |                               |   |  |   |
| Freed et al., 2014 <sup>1</sup>        | x                                    |                                 |                               |   | x  | x   |

| Article                               | Adverse impact on lecture attendance | Tackling technical difficulties | Students' reluctance to watch | Attenuates instructor-student interaction | Encourages surface learning &/or procrastination | Instructors' discomfort &/or self-consciousness |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Germany, 2012                         |                                      | x                               |                               |   |  |   |
| Gorissen et al., 2012 <sup>1</sup>    |                                      | x                               | x                             |   |  |   |
| Gosper et al., 2010                   | x                                    | x                               |                               | x   |  | x   |
| Groen et al., 2016                    |                                      | x                               | x                             |   |  |   |
| Gysbers et al., 2011 <sup>1</sup>     |                                      | x                               |                               | x   | x  |   |
| Hall and Ivaldi, 2017                 | x                                    |                                 | x                             |   | x  |   |
| Hussain et al., 2018 <sup>1</sup>     |                                      |                                 | x                             |   |  |   |
| Joseph-Richard et al., 2018           |                                      |                                 |                               |   |  | x   |
| Khan, 2016 <sup>2</sup>               |                                      | x                               |                               |   |  |   |
| Leadbeater et al., 2013 <sup>1</sup>  | x                                    |                                 |                               |   | x  |   |
| Luttenberger et al., 2018             | x                                    |                                 |                               |   |  |   |
| MacKay, in press                      |                                      | x                               |                               |   | x  | x   |
| Mallinson and Baumann, 2015           |                                      | x                               | x                             |   |  |   |
| Marchand et al., 2014 <sup>1</sup>    | x                                    |                                 |                               |   |  |   |
| McCunn and Newton, 2015 <sup>1</sup>  |                                      |                                 |                               |   | x  |   |
| Nair et al., 2015                     |                                      | x                               |                               |   |  |   |
| Nightingale et al., 2019 <sup>1</sup> |                                      |                                 |                               | x   |  |   |



| Article                              | Adverse impact on lecture attendance | Tackling technical difficulties | Students' reluctance to watch | Attenuates instructor-student interaction | Encourages surface learning &/or procrastination | Instructors' discomfort &/or self-consciousness |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Owston et al., 2011 <sup>1</sup>     | x                                    |                                 |                               |   |  |   |
| Rahman et al., 2018                  | x                                    |                                 |                               | x   |  |   |
| Saunders and Hunt, 2015 <sup>2</sup> |                                      | x                               |                               |   |  |   |
| Taplin et al., 2011 <sup>2</sup>     | x                                    |                                 | x                             |   |  |   |
| Traphagan et al., 2010               | x                                    |                                 |                               |   |  |   |
| Trenholm et al., 2019                | x                                    |                                 |                               | x   | x  |   |
| Williams et al., 2016 <sup>1</sup>   |                                      |                                 | x                             |   |  |   |
| Yeung et al., 2016 <sup>1</sup>      |                                      |                                 |                               | x   |  |   |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>20</b>                            | <b>19</b>                       | <b>12</b>                     | <b>10</b>                                 | <b>9</b>   | <b>7</b>  |

Notes. 1 = Biological Sciences, the most widely studied STEM subject area.

2 = Business/ Economics / Management, the most widely studied non-STEM subject area.