

# **Record, or not record? Examining the lecturer perspective on lecture capture and predicting the intention to use it**

Maximilian A. Kellerer

S4706218

Master Thesis, Behavior Change

Radboud University

03.07.2020

Word count: 6939

## Abstract

Capturing lectures for online availability is becoming increasingly popular in academic teaching. Students highly value lecture capture, since this provides them with flexibility and an additional method for studying. Also, universities increasingly show interest in the use of lecture capture, since the reputation of universities is dependent on satisfied students. Yet, it is unclear how lecturers perceive this procedure and how lecture capture could be promoted for increased use. The present study aimed to investigate the lecturer's perspective within two studies: In the first study, interviews were conducted with six lecturers, in order to get an overview of all the relevant factors. A qualitative analysis of the interview responses revealed five themes summarizing the lecturer's perspective. These were the I) perceived harm to student motivation, II) the comfort with being captured, III) the perceived utility, IV) the need to support students and V) felt external pressures. Whether these themes are indeed predictive of the intention to use lecture capture was tested in an online survey in the second study. Logistic regression analyses suggest that the choice to use lecture capture is dependent on the extent of felt external pressures and the perceived utility of lecture capture. This implies that universities wanting to raise the likelihood that lecturers use lecture capture should convince lecturers about the incorporated benefits of lecture capture and should clearly demonstrate their expectations. Furthermore, the study exploratively assessed the impact of the corona crisis on the perceptions of lecture capture. Findings indicate that the corona crisis had a positive impact on the perception of lecture capture among lecturers.

Increasingly, universities introduce the method of recording lectures and uploading the corresponding files to online teaching platforms (UCISA, 2016). This has the effect that the lectures become available to the students at every time and on every digital device (Edwards & Clinton, 2018), assuming access to the internet. Most commonly, scientific literature refers to this procedure as 'lecture capture' (LC), but it is also known under terms such as 'weblectures', 'lecture podcasts' or 'e-lectures'. Throughout this paper, the term lecture capture (LC) will be used.

### **1. Characteristic benefits of LC**

Next to an auditory capture, LC often includes a visual capture. Usually, a visualization of the presentation slides is provided and sometimes also a video recording of the lecturer in addition to that. Furthermore, viewing captured lectures on online teaching platforms

usually offers additional options that are incorporated into the playing software. For example, one of these options is that the speed of the lectures can be adjusted to the desired pace, allowing to speed up or slow down the played lecture (Chester et al., 2011). This feature is especially helpful for students who study in a foreign language or students who suffer from learning disabilities (Chester et al., 2011; Watt et al., 2014). Dyslexic students, for instance, may have a hard time processing presentation slides with a lot of text when sitting in the regular lecture, whereas they are in the position to slow down or pause the lecture when watching it online (Leadbeater et al., 2013). Another inherent option of LC is that the lecture tapes can be rewound which enables that difficult passages can be repeated to the student's liking (Chester et al., 2011). Beyond these study-supporting features, LC offers also non-academic upsides for students. That is because the constant availability of the lectures opens up a great deal of flexibility. Naturally, flexibility is a valuable asset for students for multiple reasons. Students may need to be absent from certain lectures because of interfering job- or family-duties (Toppin, 2011), overlaps in the study schedule (Phillips, 2005) or sickness (Brooks et al., 2011). In either case, the students are able to compensate for their absence easily, granting that LC is offered.

## **2. Student perspective on LC**

Given the above-mentioned reasons, it is not surprising that students generally have a very positive attitude on LC (Dommett et al., 2019; Edwards & Clinton, 2018; O'Callaghan et al., 2017). In a case study by Dommett et al. (2019) the majority of students even indicated to prefer a policy where lecturers must give an approved reason to be allowed to reject using LC. Furthermore, research shows that students not only like LC being offered, but they also use it frequently (Caglayan & Ustunluoglu, 2020; Gosper et al., 2008). Research suggests that students use LC for revising difficult concepts (Gosper et al., 2008), working at the own pace (Watt et al., 2014), making complementary notes (Elliott & Neal, 2016) and picking up on information that was missed out, either due to absence or inattentiveness (Groen et al., 2016).

## **3. Lecturer perspectives on LC**

Whereas the student perspective can be derived quite clearly from scientific literature, this is less the case for the perspective of lecturers. In fact, the perceptions of lecturers with regards to LC is quite understudied (O'Callaghan et al., 2017). Chang (2007) suggests that several lecturers believe students expect them to use LC, whenever it is available. This may relate to the previously described finding of Dommett et al. (2019) that students favor strict

policies to encourage LC use. Across four Australian universities, Gosper et al. (2008) investigated the motives for which lecturers use LC. Based on closed-ended survey responses, lecturers predominantly indicated to use LC for reasons that reflect student interests (Gosper et al., 2008). Items that emphasized the support for certain groups of students were selected most frequently to motivate LC usage. Especially important to the lecturers was the support for students with disabilities, students with non-English speaking backgrounds and above all, students who are unable to attend the regular lecture. Conversely to the desire to support students who can not attend the regular lectures, lecturers seem to be concerned that offering LC leads to a reduction in attendance at the regular lecture (Chang, 2007; Maynor et al., 2013). Some lecturers state that they have observed this reduction themselves (Gosper et al., 2008). Besides, lecturers seem less convinced about the effectiveness of LC on student performance and student learning, compared to student opinions (Chang, 2007; Gosper et al., 2008).

#### **4. Research goals**

Commonly, universities that promote LC leave the choice up to the lecturers who can then either decide for or against LC (Kay, 2012). Because research around this topic is scarce, it is yet unclear how the perspective of lecturers should be understood and what psychological processes can explain whether a lecturer will choose for or against LC. Universities increasingly have high interest in the use of LC, in order to satisfy the student's needs (Dey et al., 2009). That is partly because satisfaction of students leads to positive evaluations of the university which are essential to attract future students. The results of this research could thereby help universities to understand the perspective of lecturers and to build reasonable approaches to encourage the use of LC.

Additionally, the present research aims to explore the impact of the corona crisis on the perception of LC. The corona crisis had a tremendous impact on teaching in general. The ban of contact made classical face-to-face education impossible. More specifically, for lecturers of the university, this implied that regular lectures were not possible and they were basically forced to engage with web-based teaching methods. Principally, LC belongs to such methods, however, LC requires a regular lecture to take place, in order to capture it. Still, lecturers who have been using LC in previous years were able to substitute the regular lectures (which could not take place) with the uploads of lectures that were captured in previous years. Taking together the forced engagement with online teaching methods and the apparent backup function of LC, the perceptions that lecturers have of weblectures

might have changed considerably. To date, no study has investigated the impact of the coronavirus on lecturer's perception of LC.

## **5. Study 1**

Study 1 was a qualitative study in which interviews with lecturers were conducted. The goal was to explore the underlying opinions of LC and the motivations (or restraints) for using LC. The question of this study was which concepts are needed to summarize the perspective of lecturers with regards to LC. Therefore, lecturers were asked explicitly to state their opinions on LC and to give justifications for their use or neglect of LC. From the responses, themes that seem to play a decisive role in the choice of using LC were extracted.

### **5.1. Methods**

#### *5.1.1. Participants*

Six lecturers agreed to participate in an interview. Half of these six lecturers used LC in the academic year of 2019/20, whereas the other half did not. All of them were lecturers from the social science faculty, however from different departments (3x Psychology, 1x Sociology, 1x Communication Science, 1x Anthropology). Two of them were female and four were male.

Moreover, all of the lecturers were course coordinators of either two or three courses and were employed at the university for at least three years. These criteria were postulated in advance of Study 1, in order to make sure the interviewed lecturers are actually representative of the population. Besides, it was essential that the lecturers were functioning as course coordinators, since this role authorizes them to choose whether LC is used or not at the university of investigation.

#### *5.1.2. Materials*

The progression of the interview was guided by an interview schedule. The interview schedule consisted of a list of broad topics that the researcher decided to cover in each interview. These topics included the overall attitude on LC, their justification for their use or neglect of LC, their perceived pressures to use LC, their expectation of how LC affects attendance at regular lectures and how it can benefit students. The full interview schedule can be viewed in Appendix A.

In order to adhere to social distancing regulations, the interviews took place via the digital program *Zoom* (Tillman & Willings, 2020). The qualitative data was obtained by

making audio recordings of the interviews. These audio recordings were transcribed into *Word* files for further analytical processing.

The consent form that was used for this study stated that the interviews would be recorded acoustically and that this audio recording would be transcribed. Additionally, the consent form stated that the lecturers could withdraw from the interview and have their audiotapes erased until immediately after the interview. The consent form can be viewed in Appendix B.

### 5.1.3. Procedure

In total, twenty lecturers were approached by email. The email consisted of a small introduction of the research topic, the goal of the interview, the approximate duration and setting of the interview and finally, an encouragement to reply with their preferred time for an interview appointment. Two social influence techniques were applied in the email, namely social proof and the 'but you are free' technique (see, Cialdini, 1993; Guéguen & Pascual, 2000, respectively).

At the beginning of each interview, the aim of the interview was again stated to the participants. Namely, to explore the perceptions of lecturers regarding LC. Before the actual interview started, consent forms were sent to the email address of the lecturer and consent was obtained orally, due to the spatial distance. After that, the interview proceeded by covering the interview topics from the interview schedule in a semi-structured fashion. At the end of the interviews, the opinion of the lecturer was summarized by the interviewer and rechecked with the interviewee, in order to validate the information. Depending on the availability of the lecturers, the interviews took between 30 and 45 minutes.

### 5.1.4. Data Analysis

Once the audiotapes were transcribed into *Word* files, the qualitative data were analyzed by applying the step-wise approach of Braun and Clarke (2006). These six steps cover data familiarisation, coding, thematic extraction, reviewing and naming of themes and reporting the results narratively. More explicitly that means that first all transcripts were read attentively multiple times. Next, passages that were particularly emphasized, insightful or surprising were bundled into pragmatic codes. These codes were then interpreted into broader themes which form the ultimate unit of the analysis procedure (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Thereafter, the themes were reviewed for coherence, content overlaps and unnecessary information and were given concise names.

## 5.2. Results

By applying the step-wise approach for analyzing qualitative data by Braun and Clarke (2006), 14 codes were derived from the qualitative data. The codes were categorized into five themes. For a summary of all codes and themes, see Table 1. In the following, the created themes and their corresponding concepts are explained more deeply. Selective quotations from the interviewees are presented to elucidate the reasoning for certain interpretations. Behind each quotation, it is indicated whether the quote stems from a user of LC (U) or a non-user of LC (NU), which was distinguished based on their use in the academic year 2019/20.

Table 1.  
*Overview of themes and their corresponding codes.*

Themes	Codes
1. Perceived harm to student motivation	Impact on attendance rates Impact on audience attention Impact on audience participation
2. Comfort with being captured	Comfort with being recorded Concern of misuse Lack of trust in technical devices Capability to transport enthusiasm
3. Perceived utility	Academic utility Self-assessment tool Back-up function
4. Need to support students	Support for students unable to attend Support for students with disabilities Complying with student preferences
5. Felt external pressures	University demands (Social norms)*

\*Note: The concept of social norms was derived from internal databases, instead of interview responses

### 5.2.1. Perceived harm to student motivation

It appears that both lecturers who use LC and lecturers who do not use LC agree that making lectures accessible online has a negative impact on student attendance at regular lectures. This belief was shared by all interviewed lecturers. Lecturing in front of smaller audiences is interpreted as a lack of interest from the student side and thus has a demotivating effect on the lecturers. All non-users from the sample explained that this is

their foremost concern about LC (*'I think most students no longer attend...that's why I do not use it.'*; NU1). The researcher coded this as *impact on attendance rates*.

Besides that, one lecturer had the impression that LC causes students to pay less attention to the regular lectures because they are aware that they can watch the lectures again online, whenever they need to. (*'...the mind can easily wander away, since you can also watch [the lecture] at another time.'*; NU2). This assumption sounds related to the Google effect proposed by Sparrow et al. (2011). Conversely, a different lecturer had the impression that the students who show up at the regular lectures, despite LC being offered, participate more actively because the audience then consists of highly motivated students only (*'I have the most motivated students actually sitting in the classroom[...] I am certain that this facilitates active contribution.'*; U1). Both annotations were coded as distinct concepts (*impact on audience attention* and *impact on audience participation*).

### 5.2.2. Comfort with being captured

Being subject to a video recording that will get published online seemed to cause uneasiness in three of the interviewed lecturers (1 user; 2 non-users). One lecturer described this feeling as follows:

*'Actually, I hate being recorded. [...] Once I decide to record my lectures, I need to face the constant risk that everything I say can be turned against me. [...] It is the feeling of being monitored what makes it feel uncomfortable.'* (U2)

Other lecturers however seemed relaxed about this. (*'I would not really say I like being recorded, but I would also not say that it bothers me. I am fine with it.'*; U3) These annotations were coded as *comfort with being recorded*.

Besides that, one lecturer argued that LC has a high potential for misuse (*'Who knows what will happen with the videos? Parts of them could end up being shared across social media. Or they could be shown to superiors. Basically, it could be spread to anyone.'*; NU3). This was coded as *concern of misuse*.

Another lecturer expressed his general *lack of trust in technical devices*. (*'In the end, it never works out somehow. I do not like to rely on it and so I tend to avoid such procedures.'*; NU1). Related to that, one lecturer felt that LC lacks the *capability to transport the enthusiasm* of the lecturer (*'I think that the enthusiasm of a lecturer does not really show on a video. That's something that the technology can not capture. It's about the atmosphere.'*; NU3) which was coded as *capability to transport enthusiasm*.

### 5.2.3. Perceived utility

Three of the interviewed lecturers (2 users, 1 non-user) thought that LC generally enriches the learning experience of students. They argue that the possibility to revise difficult concepts helps students to comprehend the study material better. Also, the function that the pace of the lecture can be adjusted is generally perceived as useful by the lecturers. That is partly because lecturers acknowledge that their explanations are not always perfect, especially when they are lecturing in a foreign language (at the university of investigation many lecturers were teaching in both Dutch and English).

Besides, one lecturer reported that he uses LC as a *self-assessment tool* to improve his own style of teaching (*'As a bycatch, [LC] is also a very handy tool when preparing the lectures the next year. I watch my own lectures of last year as the basis for preparing the lectures this year.'*; U1).

Due to the coronavirus, regular lectures were not possible by the time of the research. This led four lecturers (3 users; 1 non-user) to perceive additional value of LC in form of a *backup function* (*'This year having an archive of recorded lectures proves to be invaluable. If my lectures hadn't been recorded last year, I wouldn't know what to do.'*; U2).

### 5.2.4. Need to support students

As previously explained, LC offers *support for students who are not able to attend* the regular lectures and *support for disabled students*. While most lecturers agreed on that, users of LC seemed to attach more relevance to it, compared to non-users. One non-user of LC stated that students who did not attend the regular lecture should not be supported (*'Students who did not make it [to the regular lecture] need to find different ways to get the study material. They can ask their peers who attended the lecture to share their notes, for example.'*; NU1). The other two non-users acknowledged how LC can support diverse students, but they talked far more reserved and less enthusiastic about the student-supporting functions (*'I guess it is true that accessing lectures online makes the lives of students much easier.'*; NU3), compared to users of LC (*'If students are not able to be physically present, then I don't see why they should be at a disadvantage.'*; U2).

Moreover, one lecturer explained that he mainly uses LC because he has the impression that his students like LC being offered. (*'I primarily record my lectures because my students want me to. Some of them are simply unable to come to my lectures and ask me to record them.'*; U2). This notion was coded as *complying with student preferences*.

### 5.2.5. Felt external pressures

Two users of LC felt that using LC is demanded by the university. The way they describe it, the university is applying subtle pressure, rather than blatant requests (*'It would be a euphemism [to say that the university is encouraging the use of LC]. [...] Pressure might be too big a word, there is some gentle pressure. I could not put my finger on it.'*; U2). A different lecturer perceived it as a recommendation (*'I think that it is recommended for the larger classes that I teach. In [the bigger lecture halls], I believe that lectures are recorded by default. I think this is encouraging teachers to record the lectures.'*; U3).

Lecturers explicitly denied that their choice would be affected by the choice of their colleagues and stated that they decide independently whether they want to use LC. However, comparing the use of LC among the different teaching departments within the faculty of social sciences, striking differences appeared. For example, almost all lecturers from Psychology were using LC, whereas almost no lecturers from Cultural Sciences were using it. This could either have something to do with the teaching department itself, or it could be a reflection of the influence of social norms on the LC choice. Therefore, the concept of social norms was categorized into the theme *felt external pressures*, even though it could not be derived from the qualitative data.

## 5.3. Discussion

Study 1 had the purpose of summarizing the view of lecturers on LC. Based on interview responses, five themes were extracted. These were I) the perceived harm to student motivation, II) comfort with being captured, III) perceived utility, IV) need to support students, and V) felt external pressures. In the following, these themes will be discussed in light of the existing literature.

Overall, the impact of LC on the motivation of students was judged as quite negative by the interviewed lecturers. Both users and non-users of LC emphasized the worry that offering LC would lead students to attend the regular lectures less than when no LC would be offered. Indeed, numerous studies provide evidence for this assumption (e.g., Drouin, 2014; Traphagan et al., 2010). Coherent with the reasoning of the interviewed lecturers, these studies report that students are discouraged to attend lectures because they can compensate for their absence easily by watching the lecture online at a more convenient time. However, there are also studies denying the existence of the effect on attendance (Dommeyer, 2017; Walls et al., 2010). These studies claim that students attend regular lectures nonetheless because they value face-to-face interactions with the lecturers and they see a lecture as an occasion where they can socialize with their peers. The fact that

the literature is highly discordant about the existence of a negative effect of LC on attendance, indicates that the confidence with which the lecturers in Study 1 refer to this effect is somewhat unjustified.

The study of Gosper et al. (2008) showed that most of the users of LC are motivated by the student-supporting function of LC. Similar reasonings were also identified from users of LC in Study 1 where some lecturers seem to view LC as a kind of service to the students. Non-users, on the other hand, seemed somewhat less enthusiastic about this student-supporting function of LC. This reluctance of non-users could be explained in two ways: On the one hand, it could be the case that non-users of LC hid their implicit attitude, which is that students should not be supported, because the interviewer was a student himself. Hence, they may have agreed formally that students should be supported, due to social desirability, rather than their actual opinions. On the other hand, it could be the case that some of the non-users of LC never thought about whether students should be supported by offering LC or have strongly negative attitudes on LC and thereby subtly obstructed the conversation, in order to avoid cognitive dissonance.

The finding that lecturers feel pressured to use LC is related to the observations of Chang (2007). However, in the sample of Chang (2007) the lecturers described the pressure to originate from students, whereas lecturers from Study 1 rather felt pressured by the university. The presence of external pressure in form of social norms to use LC was denied by the interviewed lecturers. Yet, inspections of internal databases showing which lecturers are using LC demonstrate that there are clear differences between teaching departments. This could be explained to be caused by inherent properties of the teaching department directly. However, it is difficult to explain how such a causation could make sense. A plausible alternative explanation would be that the strikingly different usage patterns across teaching departments arise due to social norm influences. Namely, that lecturers are influenced by the choice of their surrounding colleagues sharing the same teaching department.

The interview responses suggest that lecturers vary in their degree of comfort with being recorded and uploaded online. Some lecturers expressed their discomfort with being recorded or their concern that the video material could be misused (e.g., shared with externals). Lecturers who have such thoughts may be much more hesitant to use LC. Related to that, Chang (2007) found that approximately half of the lecturers using LC reported that they have become more cautious about what they say in the lectures which is in line with the observations of Study 1. Moreover, this heightened wariness can diminish spontaneity and negatively affect the experience of lecturing (Joseph-Richard et al., 2010).

There seem to be no scientific studies that explored how lecturers perceive the utility of LC. Still, it could be argued that perceived utility is highly related to the need to support students, since lecturers who value the student-supporting functions of LC, automatically perceive some extent of utility. Nevertheless, the perceived utility theme rather refers to how much lecturers think that LC can add something valuable to their teaching. This can be reflected in academic value, such as student performance or in their own utilization, such as using LC as a tool to improve the lecturing style or as a backup option, in case regular lectures are not possible (e.g., due to illness, organizational issues).

Unfortunately, Study 1 has the shortcoming that the codings and arrangements of themes have been done by one researcher only. Hence, the inter-rater reliability for the codings could not be established. Furthermore, all users of LC from the sample were from the teaching area of Psychology which implies that there was a structural difference between users and non-users, besides the willingness to use LC. This threatens the internal validity of the conclusions of Study 1.

Beyond all, the coronavirus has drawn extra attention to the topic of LC. Because regular lectures could not take place by the time of this research, the entire domain of online teaching has come into much larger focus. Lecturers who have been using LC in the previous year(s) happily reported that they can upload their captured lectures as a substitute for the cancelled regular lectures. They communicated that this has been saving them from a lot of extra work. Lecturers who did not record their lectures reported that they have been forced to arrange the curriculum of their courses in other ways.

## **6. Study 2**

The question of Study 2 was to find out which of the themes, that were derived from the lecturer's responses in Study 1, are actually predictive of having the intention to use LC. Results to this question could help universities to decide how to promote LC usage among lecturers. The hypothesis was that each theme significantly increases the chance that a lecturer intends to use LC. Furthermore, the study exploratively investigated the effect of the corona crisis on the lecturer's perceptions of LC.

### **6.1. Methods**

#### *6.1.1. Participants*

The specified criteria from Study 1 that lecturers had to be employed at the university for a certain amount of time and to coordinate multiple courses were not applied in Study 2. Nevertheless, the lecturers had to be functioning as course coordinators of at

least one course because at the university of investigation this was required, in order to be able to decide whether LC is used in certain course. Lecturers who took part in Study 1 were not eligible for Study 2.

Out of more than one hundred lecturers that have been contacted for participation, 36 took part in the online survey. Three lecturers completed the survey only partly and therefore had to be excluded from further analyses. Thus, the final sample consisted of 33 lecturers. All of them were lecturers from the social science faculty at the Radboud University Nijmegen. Twenty-two of the lecturers from the final sample were male, 9 were female. Thirteen reported to teach in the department of Psychology, nine in Communication Science, six in Sociology, five in Pedagogical Science and one in Anthropology (the addition of these numbers exceeds the count of the final sample because some lecturers teach in multiple departments).

#### 6.1.2. *Materials*

The online survey was developed on the website *Qualtrics.com* (Ginn, 2018). At the beginning of the survey, the participants were clarified that all items relate to the concept of LC and not online lectures in general. This was important to clarify because by the time of the research, some lecturers were giving live lectures online or were uploading lectures which they have recorded from home, in order to account for lectures that had to be cancelled, due to the coronavirus. Hence, the clarification had to purpose to prevent possible availability biases. After that, measurements for all five extracted factors from Study 1 were obtained. Each of these five factors was measured with four items. All of these items were phrased in form of statements on which lecturers had to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with the statement on a 7-point scale. In the end, the survey asked the lecturers whether they have been using LC in the present academic year and whether they intend to use LC in the next academic year. In addition, the survey asked for the departments in which the participating lecturers were teaching and for demographic information (gender and age). The full survey can be viewed in Appendix C.

#### 6.1.3. *Procedure*

Similarly to Study 1, lecturers were again approached by email. The email stated the goal of the research, namely to investigate the opinions of lecturers on LC and that the survey would take approximately ten minutes. Furthermore, the email entailed a link that the lecturers could click, in order to reach the survey.

#### 6.1.4. Data Analysis

The main hypothesis was tested with a binary regression analysis on the dependent variable which was the intention to use LC in the future, once regular lectures can take place again (yes/no) with five predictors. These predictors reflected measurements of the five themes that were extracted in Study 1. The assumption of linearity was checked by computing the logits of the continuous predictor variables, according to the Box-Tidwell (1962) procedure.

The survey included an item that asked the lecturers whether they think that the corona crisis has changed their perspective on LC. Next to the response options 'yes' and 'no', the item also allowed for text entry that encouraged the participants to explain how the corona crisis changed their view on LC or why it did not change it. By inspecting the text entries and the distribution of 'yes' to 'no' answers, this notion of the study was ascertained exploratively. Moreover, it was analyzed whether non-users formed the intention to use LC in the future and whether users of LC suddenly intended to quit using LC. Unfortunately, no data regarding LC perceptions before the corona crisis was available which could have used to study the effect of the corona crisis more precisely with a repeated measures design.

### 6.2. Results

A binomial logistic regression was performed to test the effects of the five predictors (perceived harm to student motivation, comfort with being captured, perceived utility, need to support students and felt external pressures) on the likelihood that a lecturer intends to use LC in the future. The regression model was statistically significant ( $X^2(5) = 18.58$ ,  $p < .005$ ). The model explained 70.3% of the variance in the intention to use LC and correctly classified 90.9% of the cases. Sensitivity was 96.3%, specificity was 66.7%, positive predictive value was 92.9% and negative predictive value was 80%. None of the five predictors reached statistical significance (as shown in Table 2).

Linearity of the continuous variables with respect to the logit of the dependent variable was assessed via the Box-Tidwell (1962) procedure. A Bonferroni correction was applied using all eleven terms in the model resulting in statistical significance being accepted when  $p < .00454$  (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2014). Based on this assessment, all continuous independent variables were found to be linearly related to the logit of the dependent variable.

A sensitivity power analysis showed that there is an 80% chance to identify a predictor as significant, if the odds ratio is at least 9.09, assuming a real effect in the

population. That means that an increase of one unit in the predictor variable would have to cause the probability of intending to use LC in the future to become nine times larger which shows that the power of the study is quite low.

Table 2.

*Logistic regression predicting the intention of using LC in the future based on five predictor variables.*

Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	p	Odds Ratio	95% CI for Odds Ratio	
						Lower	Upper
Perceived harm to student motivation	0.13	0.22	0.35	.556	1.14	0.74	1.74
Comfort with being captured	0.20	0.25	0.67	.414	1.22	0.75	1.98
Perceived utility	0.38	0.35	1.17	.279	1.47	0.73	2.92
Need to support students	0.31	0.37	0.73	.392	1.37	0.67	2.81
Felt external pressures	0.58	0.31	3.38	.066	1.78	0.96	3.30

The observed odds ratios indicate that each predictor raised the likelihood that a lecturer intends to use LC which is in line with the hypothesis. The predictor perceived harm to student motivation was reversed, to make comparisons easier. However, none of the predictors were statistically significant. A statistical explanation for that is that the sample was not only small but also not evenly spread across the two outcomes of the dependent variable. In fact, only six lecturers did not have the intention to use LC in the future, while there were 27 who did have the intention. That means that at step 0 where none of the five predictor variables are used, the model already predicted every subject, except six, correctly (81.8%). In step 1, the five predictor variables are added to the model with the theory in mind that the predictors can distinguish these six subjects from the rest. Therefore, it is not surprising that the unique contributions of the predictors are small. To assess the contribution of the five predictors more specifically, the same regression analysis was conducted for each predictor separately, hence five times in total. The observed coefficients for the separate regressions are displayed in Table 3. When tested in

separate analyses, the predictors felt external pressures and perceived utility were statistically significant.

Table 3.

*Logistic regressions predicting intention to use LC in the future with each predictor assessed separately.*

Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	p	Odds Ratio	95% CI for Odds Ratio	
						Lower	Upper
Perceived harm to student motivation	0.23	0.13	2.97	.085	1.26	0.97	1.64
Comfort with being captured	0.07	0.11	0.38	.540	1.07	0.86	1.33
Perceived utility	0.29	0.14	4.60	.032	1.34	1.03	1.76
Need to support students	0.23	0.14	2.91	.088	1.26	0.97	1.65
Felt external pressures	0.45	0.17	7.02	.008	1.57	1.12	2.19

The impact of the corona crisis on the lecturer’s perceptions of LC was assessed with frequencies. Out of the 33 lecturers, ten indicated that their perspective on LC has changed, due to the corona crisis. Inspecting the explanations that lecturers gave suggests that the perspective of LC has become more positive overall. Especially the perceived utility seems to have increased (*‘I might browse through last year’s web lectures to look for the successful and less successful explanations and the best and worst clips.’*; Lecturer 2). Some lecturers stated that their perspective on LC has become more positive, since they had to engage more with digital teaching methods over the course of the corona crisis. One lecturer described this change as follows:

*‘The possibility to have an alternative to facilitate teaching in cases when it is not possible, has proven to be much more readily available than I knew before the corona crisis. Up until the corona crisis, digitalization of teaching felt as another additional burden. This feeling has thus changed somewhat in favor of digital lectures.’*; Lecturer 33

Two lecturers who did not use LC before had the intention to use LC in the future. Still, most of the lecturers emphasize that lecture clips which are uploaded online can not replace the traditional lectures, mainly because lecturers feel that the interaction with students gets lost this way (*'Distant teaching can not compensate for live meetings. Non-verbal interactions and discussions are essential for good teaching.'*; Lecturer 21).

### **6.3. Discussion**

The purpose of Study 2 was to test the themes that were extracted from interviews in Study 1 for their predictive power on the intention to use LC in the future. It was hypothesized that each theme would increase the chance that a lecturer has the intention to use LC. Based on the results of this study, none of the themes could predict the intention significantly within one model. This implies acceptance of the null hypotheses meaning that none of the themes increases the chance that a lecturer intends to use LC.

Nonetheless, it needs to be acknowledged that the model with five predictors together was highly underpowered and perhaps too ambitious. Testing the predictors in separate regression models, with the purpose of raising the power, revealed that the themes felt external pressures and perceived utility were statistically significant. This allows for the conclusion that these themes predict the intention to use LC in a vacuum where all other factors are ignored. The significance of felt external pressures suggests that the expectations of the university affect the lecturers in their choice of using LC. This is interesting in light of previous findings in which the perceived pressure to use LC is described to origin from students (Chang, 2007), instead of the employing university. This creates new ground for future research. For example, it could be insightful to compare lecturers' perceptions of diverse forms of pressure, such as pressure from students, from the university or from the choice of their colleagues. Social norms among lecturers were coded as part of the felt external pressures. Therefore, the results also suggest that lecturers are sensitive to the choice of their colleagues which explains the observed differences of LC use across the teaching departments. Interestingly, in Study 1 lecturers indicated that the pressure from the university is only mild and the idea of social norm influences was totally rejected. Thus, lecturers seem to underestimate the extent to which they are influenced by external pressures.

The perceived utility measured the extent to which lecturers saw benefits of LC for their teaching. This involves the degree to which lecturers think that an archive of lectures is useful and the degree to which they think LC can enhance student performance and their own lecturing style. According to many comments from lecturers, the perceived utility has

increased over the course of the corona crisis. Apparently, some lecturers gained more experience with web-based teaching practices and thereby became more convinced to use LC. In addition to that, the backup function of LC became very evident which seemed to further increase the perceived utility. Some lecturers who were not using LC changed their mind and do intend to capture their lectures, once regular lectures will be back. Thus, the corona crisis led some non-users of LC to switch their choice. However, there is no certainty for this claim, since there may be other reasons to switch from not using LC to using it. For example, one of the interviewed non-users in Study 1 stated that she did not use LC because in that academic year a lot of changes were made within her subject (e.g. new literature, etc.).

Altogether, the results of this research fit nicely with the theory of planned behavior by Ajzen (1991). This theory proposes that the intention for a certain behavior can be predicted by the attitude towards the behavior, the subjective norm, and the perceived behavioral control. In the present research, the theme of perceived utility to some extent reflects an (utility-based) attitude towards LC. It can be argued that the concepts are somewhat related to each other because perceiving more utility is likely to lead to a more positive attitude and vice versa (e.g., Applegate, 2001). The theme of felt external pressures conceptualized both the perceived norm of using LC and the perceived level of expectation from the university for using LC. Again, this relates well to the factors established by the theory of planned behavior. Firstly, norms are an integrative part of the theory of planned behavior and describe the extent to which an individual believes that the behavior will result in approval. For lecturers, this means that they subjectively evaluate whether LC is customary in their teaching department. Secondly, the perceived university expectations might be linked to the degree to which lecturers see themselves in control for choosing against LC. Therefore, the results of the present research illustrate that the theory of planned behavior serves as a solid framework to understand whether a lecturer will have the intention to use LC. That is because all determinants of an intention that the theory proposes could be traced back to specific findings of this study.

Still, there are some considerable limitations of Study 2. Because the sample size was quite low, the uneven distribution among the intentions to use LC in the future preponderated the analysis that was initially planned. An explanation attempt for the uneven distribution would be that lecturers who are not in favor of LC ignored the invitation email or deleted it immediately because they have no interest in this topic. A different explanation would be that non-users of LC participated less in Study 2 because they thought that experience with LC is required, even though the email explicitly stated that this was not the

case. A shortcoming of this research is that the measurements of the predictors were not tested for their validity. Hence, the possibility that the used predictors in Study 2 measure different constructs than the extracted themes from Study 1 can not be ruled out. Consequently, the conclusions of Study 2 have to be evaluated with care.

## **7. Conclusions on how LC could be promoted**

Despite the limitations, the findings of this research can serve as a basis to develop approaches that promote the use of LC among lecturers. For example, since university pressure was found to be effective, a policy could be introduced where all lectures are captured by default. Still, such a policy should allow lecturers to opt-out to show acknowledgement for the lecturer perspective that LC is also connected to certain disadvantages. Alternatively, the various utilities of LC could be demonstrated to the lecturers which should make the intention to use LC more likely, according to the results of this research. Partly, this already happened with the implications of the corona crisis where lecturers had to engage themselves more with digital teaching methods. Thereby, it is also conceivable that lecturers will start using LC regardlessly, once regular lectures can take place again.

## **REFERENCES**

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179-211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-t](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-t)
- Applegate, B. K. (2001). Penal austerity: Perceived utility, desert, and public attitudes toward prison amenities. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 25, 253-268. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02886849>
- Box, G. E. P., & Tidwell, P. W. (1962). Transformation of the independent variables. *Technometrics*, 4, 531-550.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Brooks, C., Epp, C. D., Logan, G., & Greer, J. (2011). The who, what, when, and why of lecture capture. *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Learning Analytics and Knowledge - LAK '11*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2090116.2090128>
- Caglayan, E., & Ustunluoglu, E. (2020). A study exploring students' usage patterns and adoption of lecture capture. *Technology, Knowledge and Learning*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-020-09435-9>

- Chang, S., (2007). Academic perceptions of the use of Lectopia: A University of Melbourne example. In *ICT: Providing choices for learners and learning. Proceedings of Ascilite, Singapore 2007*. <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/singapore07/procs/chang.pdf6/1/08>. Accessed 10 August 2014.
- Chester, A., Buntine, A., Hammond, K., & Atkinson, L. (2011). Podcasting in education: Student attitudes, behaviour and self-efficacy. *Educational Technology & Society*, 14, 236-247. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ930250> Accessed May 2020
- Cialdini, R. B. (1993). *Influence: Science and practice* (3rd ed.). HarperCollins Publishers.
- Dey, E. L., Burn, H. E., & Gerdes, D. (2009). Bringing the classroom to the web: Effects of using new technologies to capture and deliver lectures. *Research in Higher Education*, 50, 377-393. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-009-9124-0>
- Dommett, E. J., van Tilburg, W., & Gardner, B. (2019). A case study: Views on the practice of opting in and out of lecture capture. *Education and Information Technologies*, 24, 3075-3090. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-019-09918-y>
- Dommeyer, C. J. (2017). Lecture capturing: Its effects on students' absenteeism, performance, and impressions in a traditional marketing research course. *Journal of Education for Business*, 92, 388-395. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08832323.2017.1398129>
- Drouin, M. A. (2014). If you record it, some won't come: Using lecture capture in introductory psychology. *Teaching of Psychology*, 41, 11-19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0098628313514172>
- Edwards, M. R., & Clinton, M. E. (2018). A study exploring the impact of lecture capture availability and lecture capture usage on student attendance and attainment. *Higher Education*, 77, 403-421. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-018-0275-9>
- Elliott, C., & Neal, D. (2016). Evaluating the use of lecture capture using a revealed preference approach. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 17, 153-167. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787416637463>
- Ginn, J. (2018). Qualtrics: Retrieve survey data using the Qualtrics API. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 3, 690. <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.00690>
- Gosper, M., Green, D., McNeill, M., Phillips, R., Preston, G., & Woo, K. (2008). The impact of web-based lecture technologies on current and future practices in learning and teaching. [http://researchrepository.murdoch.edu.au/id/eprint/12120/1/ce6-22\\_final2.pdf](http://researchrepository.murdoch.edu.au/id/eprint/12120/1/ce6-22_final2.pdf). Accessed May 2020.
- Groen, J. F., Quigley, B., & Herry, Y. (2016). Examining the use of lecture capture technology: Implications for teaching and learning. *The Canadian Journal for the*

- Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 7.  
<https://doi.org/10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2016.1.8>
- Guéguen, N., & Pascual, A. (2000). Evocation of freedom and compliance: The but you are free of... technique. *Current Research in Social Psychology*, 5, 264– 270.
- Joseph-Richard, P., Jessop, T., Okafor, G., Almpanis, T., & Price, D. (2018). Big Brother or harbinger of best practice: Can lecture capture actually improve teaching? *British Educational Research Journal*, 44, 377-392. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3336>
- Kay, R. H. (2012). Exploring the use of video podcasts in education: A comprehensive review of the literature. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 28, 820-831.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2012.01.011>
- Leadbeater, W., Shuttleworth, T., Couperthwaite, J., & Nightingale, K. P. (2013). Evaluating the use and impact of lecture recording in undergraduates: Evidence for distinct approaches by different groups of students. *Computers & Education*, 61, 185-192.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2012.09.011>
- Maynor, L. M., Barrickman, A. L., Stamatakis, M. K., & Elliott, D. P. (2013). Student and faculty perceptions of lecture recording in a doctor of pharmacy curriculum. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 77, 165.  
<https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe778165>
- O'Callaghan, F. V., Neumann, D. L., Jones, L., & Creed, P. A. (2017). The use of lecture recordings in higher education: A review of institutional, student, and lecturer issues. *Education and Information Technologies*, 22, 399-415.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-015-9451-z>
- Phillips, R. (2005). Challenging the primacy of lectures: The dissonance between theory and practice in university teaching. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 2. <http://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol2/iss1/2> Accessed Jun 2020
- Sparrow, B., Liu, J., & Wegner, D. M. (2011). Google effects on memory: Cognitive consequences of having information at our fingertips. *Science*, 333, 776-778.  
<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1207745>
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2014). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Harlow, England: Pearson.
- Tillman, M., & Willings, A. (2020). *What is Zoom and how does it work? Plus tips and tricks*. Pocket-lint. <https://www.pocket-lint.com/apps/news/151426-what-is-zoom-and-how-does-it-work-plus-tips-and-tricks>

- Toppin, I. N. (2011). Video lecture capture (VLC) system: A comparison of student versus faculty perceptions. *Education and Information Technologies*, 16, 383-393.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-010-9140-x>
- Traphagan, T., Kucsera, J. V., & Kishi, K. (2010). Impact of class lecture webcasting on attendance and learning. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 58, 19-37. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-009-9128-7>
- UCISA (2016) *2016 Survey of technology enhanced learning for higher education in the UK*.  
<http://www.ucisa.ac.uk/tel>.
- Walls, S. M., Kucsera, J. V., Walker, J. D., Acee, T. W., McVaugh, N. K., & Robinson, D. H. (2010). Podcasting in education: Are students as ready and eager as we think they are? *Computers & Education*, 54, 371-378.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2009.08.018>
- Watt, S., Vajoczki, S., Voros, G., Vine, M., Fenton, N., & Tarkowski, J. (2014). Lecture capture: An effective tool for universal instructional design? *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 44, 1-29. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1038356.pdf>

#### Appendix A: Interview schedule

Note: At the university of investigation the term ‘weblecture’ was more familiar than ‘lecture capture’.

1. Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Thanks &amp; welcome</li> <li>- Goal of the interview</li> <li>- Duration</li> <li>- Any questions?</li> </ul>
2. Consent form	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Explain: Consent form per email</li> <li>- Oral consent</li> </ul>
3. Interview	
a. What is your overall attitude on weblectures?	<p>Checkpoints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Is the attitude clear?</i></li> <li>- <i>Is it clear how certain aspects are valenced?</i></li> </ul>
b. Which reasons made you decide for/against weblectures?	<p>Checkpoints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Did the lecturer name concrete reasons?</i></li> <li>- <i>Is the reasoning understandable?</i></li> </ul>
c. Pressure / expectations	<p>Checkpoints:</p>

(Do you experience any expectations or pressure from others to use weblectures?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>If yes, is it clear where the pressure origins?</i></li> <li>- <i>Check: Do the decisions of colleagues play a role?</i></li> </ul>
d. Impact on attendance (How do you think offering weblectures relates to the attendance at regular lectures?)	<p><i>Checkpoints:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Did the lecturer explain how such an impact could exist?</i></li> <li>- <i>Check: Are there other concerns?</i></li> </ul>
e. Advantages for students? (Do you think weblectures are useful to students?)	<p><i>Checkpoints:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>In case not clear: For example, when students are unable to attend the regular lectures</i></li> <li>- <i>Were academic advantages discussed?</i></li> <li>- <i>Were non-academic advantages discussed?</i></li> </ul>
4. Ending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Summary of the interview</li> <li>- Summary of the interviewee perspective</li> <li>- Ask if lecturer wants to be informed about results</li> <li>- Ask if lecturer can be contacted for follow-up questions</li> <li>- Ask if lecturer has any questions</li> <li>- Thank for time and efforts</li> <li>- End</li> </ul>

## Appendix B: Consent form

### INFORMED CONSENT FORM (AUDIOTAPE)

#### Consent Form for Audio taping and Transcribing Interviews

Researcher: Maximilian Kellerer, Radboud University Nijmegen, Faculty of Social Sciences

This study involves the audio taping of your interview with the researcher. Neither your name nor any other identifying information will be associated with the audiotape or the transcript. Only the research team will be able to listen to the tapes.

The tapes will be transcribed by the researcher and erased once the transcriptions are checked for accuracy. Transcripts of your interview may be reproduced in whole or in part for use in presentations or written products that result from this study. Neither your name

nor any other identifying information (such as your voice) will be used in presentations or in written products resulting from the study.

Immediately following the interview, you will be given the opportunity to have the tape erased if you wish to withdraw your consent to taping or participation in this study.

By signing this form you are consenting to:

- having your interview taped;
- to having the tape transcribed;
- use of the written transcript in presentations and written products.

By checking the box in front of each item, you are consenting to participate in that procedure.

This consent for taping is effective until August 2020. On or before that date, the tapes will be destroyed.

Participant's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

### **Appendix C:** Online survey items

*Note:* At the university of investigation the term 'weblecture' was more familiar than 'lecture capture'.

Block 1/5 (**Perceived utility**): Below you will find four statements. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with them. Try to answer as truthful as you can.

Weblectures are a useful tool to self-assess the own style of teaching.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly agree

Weblectures can facilitate students' comprehension of the study material.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly agree

Offering weblectures will increase the academic performance of students, compared to no weblectures being offered.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly agree

It is useful to have a weblecture (from a previous year), when the regular lecture can not take place.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly agree

Block 2/5 (**Perceived harm to student motivation**): Below you will find four statements. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with them. Try to answer as truthful as you can.

Offering weblectures influences the students' motivation to attend regular lectures.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly agree

Offering weblectures discourages students to attend the regular lectures.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly agree

Students who attend the regular lectures, despite weblectures being offered, generally participate more actively in the regular lectures.

- Strongly agree
- Agree

- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly agree

If weblectures are provided, students will pay less attention in the regular lecture, because they can compensate for missed information by re-watching the lecture online.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly agree

Block 3/5 (**Need to support students**): Below you will find four statements. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with them. Try to answer as truthful as you can.

Weblectures should be offered, if students desire to have them.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly agree

I can understand when students are not able to attend the regular lectures.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly agree

Students who miss regular lectures should easily be able to compensate for their absence.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly agree

Weblectures are a necessity for students with a physical disability.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Block 4/5 (**Felt external pressures**): Below you will find four statements. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with them. Try to answer as truthful as you can.

I perceive weblectures as a standard procedure (independently of the corona crisis).

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Most of my close colleagues use weblectures (independently of the corona crisis).

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

I feel expected by the university to use weblectures.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Deciding against weblectures implies trouble with supervisors or career issues.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Disagree

- Strongly agree

Block 5/5 (**Comfort with being captured**): Below you will find four statements. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with them. Try to answer as truthful as you can.

I have no problem with being recorded.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly agree

The technique that supports recording and publishing of weblectures are unreliable and often cause problems.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly agree

Weblectures are well-suited to show the enthusiasm of the lecturer.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly agree

I am afraid that the video material will be misused (e.g. spreaded to externals).

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly agree

---

What is your gender?

- Female
- Male
- Other

What is your age?

- 18 - 34
- 35 - 44
- 45 - 54
- 55 - 64
- 65 - 74
- 75 - 84
- 85 or older

What is your area of teaching? (Multiple answers are possible)

- Anthropology and Development Sociology
- Communication Science
- Pedagogic Science
- Psychology
- Sociology

Did your perspective on weblectures change over the course of the corona crisis? Feel free to add your reasoning as a comment.

- Yes... [optional text entry]
- No... [optional text entry]

Did you use weblectures (for at least one of your courses) in this academic year (2019-2020)?

- Yes
- No

Do you intend to use weblectures (for at least one of your courses) once regular lectures can take place again?

- Yes
- No