

## Feedback Made Easy Through Facebook Live

**Rita C. Ramos**

University of the Philippines Open University, Philippines  
rita.ramos@upou.edu.ph

**Ria Valerie D. Cabanes**

University of the Philippines Open University, Philippines  
riavalerie.cabanes@upou.edu.ph

---

**ARTICLE INFO:** Received: **16 Nov 2021**; Revised: **08 Mar 2021**;  
Accepted: **09 June 2021**; Available Online: **15 June 2021**

---

### Abstract

*There is a growing diversity in the types of learners and technology available nowadays. Hence, the mechanism of feedback needs innovation to embrace diversity. Feedback is paramount in the assessment of learning. Traditionally, written scoring rubrics alone was sufficient feedback, but the growing number of students and similarly increasing variety of learning styles prompted the investigators to use Facebook Live on top of the written score rubric in a nursing course. The online nursing course comprises graduate students from different parts of the globe with different time availability. Facebook Live was used to give feedback for quizzes and assignments. The Facebook Live sessions used were guided by a scoring rubric, giving both general and specific comments. This study aimed to determine the quality of feedback as perceived by the students using Facebook Live. Feedback through Facebook Live was found to significantly promote fast interaction. The recorded versions resolved the issues of synchronous learning for students from different parts of the world. The students considered feedback through Facebook Live to be convenient, social, and motivational.*

**Keywords:** *Open and distance learning, technology, student feedback, online feedback, Facebook*

### Introduction

The growing diversity of the types of distance learners and technology available these days calls for innovation in feedback. As a case in point, only 36 out of 121 students in a nursing subject during the academic year of 2018-2019 were living in the Philippines. Since 1998, it has been established that students' learning styles should be considered as it had a significant impact on their education (Montgomery & Groat, 1998). The number of students enrolling in open and distance learning is also increasing. The COVID-19 pandemic even forced remote learning on schools globally. With this, unique characteristics, learning styles, coping mechanisms, and struggles, on top of the diverse locations of the students – the need for a new channel to address concerns and give feedback became evident to increase educators' presence and motivate students.

Although several platforms are available, such as Skype and Google Meet, which allow people to interact in real time, the investigators considered several factors in choosing Facebook Live as their main avenue. Primarily, the Philippines is South-east Asia's second slowest for internet connection (Porcalla, 2020). Skype recommends having as much as 8mbps for a group video of more than seven people (Skype, 2020), and Google Meet requires 2mbps to 4mbps to accommodate 10 participants (SupportGoogle, 2020). Although Facebook Live can also require 4mbps, Philippine telecommunication companies are offering affordable data promotions for the Facebook app. Secondly, the mbps demand would be difficult for some because the student count for some courses reaches as much as 140. Although the teacher does all the talking through Facebook Live, students can freely send reactions and questions by text at any time, making it interactive. Fourth, Facebook Live's feature that automatically publishes a video recording allows students who cannot join a synchronous activity to watch it at their most convenient time. Lastly, most if not all students already have Facebook accounts.

### **Research Objective**

This study aims to determine the quality of feedback given through Facebook Live as perceived by students.

### **Literature Review**

Excellent feedback is that which is given at the right time. Giving feedback immediately can improve performance, even if there is a delay in review (Attali & Van der Kleij, 2017). However, technology can cause teachers to purposely postpone giving feedback (Kureethara Manuel & Hunchman, 2020). Digital learning requires more feedback as students are stimulated to learn independently. In the medical field, it was discovered that insufficient feedback was given to students as it was considered an interruption during training. The same study found that feedback given explicitly even if it was constructive, was interpreted negatively by younger trainees and taken positively by seniors (Colthorpe, 2013; Modak & Gray, 2020). The study of Bohnacker-Bruce (2017) cited several types of feedback, namely, written feedback on the cover sheet, group feedback on the learning network, written feedback to a student by e-mail, verbal feedback to individual students, group feedback in a seminar or lecture, and feedback from peers or discussion of work in groups.

The different types of feedback the educational system had been using were evidently successful in providing a mentor's opinions – summative, formative, and corrective. They were given informally and formally, and through student peer, and self-feedback (FU). Written feedback could result in discreet, disturbing, or negative emotions (Han & Hyland, 2019). However, there is insufficient literature on the quality of feedback given live in a digital classroom where the students could comment and ask questions, and the teachers could answer instantly.

The number and variety of students in the online world has increased significantly. In 2018, It was reported that secondary school students in the Philippines showed the intention of continuing tertiary education through a digital school (Calora & Lleva, 2018). Although the number of college students taking at least one digital class in the United States fell by 1.6% in 2018 (Lederman, 2018), the inevitable consequence of COVID-19 pandemic leads almost every school worldwide to transition to e-learning. The student population diversity calls for a transformation of blended learning design, tailoring to the characteristics of enrollees (Boelens et al., 2018). How the educators deliver their feedback should adjust to this

growing diversity. The contents of the feedback that the students receive should fit the vast array of their needs (the different time zones for example, or their availability since most of them are also working) but should still be guided by a scoring rubric.

Live online streaming allows people to witness an event as it happens even if they are miles away. The birth of this technology allowed communication to be enhanced. Live reactions from the audience can now be received, and the person behind the camera can directly interact with hundreds and thousands of viewers. A study by Safar & Alkhezzi (2016) found that online streaming was an innovative tool for teaching, learning, professional development, and teacher preparation. The participants in this study, who were teachers, gave it a high satisfaction score ( $M=4.52$ ;  $SD=0.23$ ).

In their website, it is stated that Facebook Live lets people, public figures, and pages share live videos with their friends and followers on Facebook. A live broadcast can be as short as a few minutes to as much as four hours. It can send a notification to friends and followers as the person goes live, and if they cannot join the live streaming, they can replay the video at their most convenient time.

The use of Facebook Live as a tool matches the characteristics of high-quality academic feedback in the modern world – it is interactive, evaluates past tasks, and discusses what they could improve in the future (Gibbs & Simpson, 2004). Facebook Live has been used to attain various educational goals like nutrition education and breast cancer screening advocacy (Tso & Parikh 2020; Adedokun et al., 2020).

Inspired by the new feedback delivery (Orsmond et al., 2013), Facebook Live is appropriate primarily because it encourages a dialogue between the giver and receiver of feedback. Although teachers are the only ones on video, students can comment and ask questions through the chat panel. This leads to another feature: students are encouraged to be proactive in working with feedback. Furthermore, since Facebook Live can accommodate hundreds and thousands of viewers, it is possible to involve peer interaction. Lastly, the feedback content explicitly encourages self-assessment or regulation as they can reflect on their performance during the previous exam or task.

The variety of feedback styles can be perceived differently depending on certain factors such as the type of background of the students, socio-cultural and socio-critical perspectives, and even feedback-seeking behaviours (Evans 2013; Brutus & Greguras, 2008). This was another prompt for the investigators to make use of a new channel to give feedback. Since Facebook Live is interactive, it can help teachers to quickly assess these backgrounds and concerns before giving feedback. A brief socialization can warm the students up and promote participation eventually.

Ultimately, the possibility of replaying and reacting to the video at the students' most convenient time makes Facebook Live a powerful tool to deliver evaluations. The educators can also view the feedback again to assess the contributions of those who could not participate during the live sessions at their preferred time.

## **Research Method**

### **Research Design**

The study used a descriptive research design to investigate the students' perception of the quality of the feedback through Facebook Live. Descriptive studies explore and describe certain phenomena (Gray et al., 2017).

## Sampling

Total population sampling in a class where feedback through Facebook Live was implemented in this study. Questionnaires were distributed to participants at the end of the semester. Facebook Live was delivered only to students enrolled in the academic year 2018-2019. Those who added the Facebook Group of the class and were able to watch the feedback were recruited to join the study.

## Research Instruments

A survey with questions adapted from the developed questionnaire of Mulliner and Tucker (2017); and Crook et al. (2011) was used to evaluate the quality of the feedback given through Facebook Live. The questionnaire was made up of 31 questions with Likert-type scale answers and 3 optional qualitative questions. It aimed to gather students' perception of these two general concepts: the feedback itself and the faculty's manner of delivering the feedback. The questions were divided into several categories to pinpoint which areas needed improvement. First was the students' knowledge about the feedback process, which could be answered by questions 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6. Students' perspective was also highlighted in the following areas: (a) timing of the feedback, which was answered by questions 3 and 31, (b) feedback and feed-forwarding, which were associated with questions 9, 14, and 23, (c) interaction with teachers and classmates through question 8, (d) benefits of feedback through questions 24-27, and (e) manner in which the Faculties In-Charge facilitated and delivered the feedback sessions through questions 15-22. Comments and suggestions and their interest in joining and promoting Facebook Live feedback were also assessed using the last 7 questions.

## Findings

A total of 52 completed questionnaires were returned. The questions were grouped according to the set of questionnaires from authors and were computed per item. Most of the study's participants were majors in Nursing Administration (59.1%), followed by Adult Health (27.3%), and Maternal and Child (9.1%). Two students did not specify their major.

Additionally, the following statements were shared by students at the closing remarks of one of the feedback through Facebook Live sessions.

"Effective communication achieved through Facebook Live" – V. J.

"I love Facebook Live interactive... through this I can understand some concepts that I really don't understand" – C. S.

"We get to see our teachers and our questions are answered right away" – M. M.

"Thru FB Live *parang ang dali* ng N204 (Through FB Live it seems that the subject is easy)" – F. J.

"*Nacomplete po ng FB Live yung* (FB Live can fill the) communication gap between students and teachers" – R. B.

“This FB live makes me feel that I am indeed getting Master of Arts in Nursing classes. This is very informative and modern po. *Saktong sakto sa mga Millennial na tulad namin.* (Very appropriate for millennials like us.)” – S. M. S.

The students felt relief and relaxation because of the short interactive sessions of the Facebook Live feedback. Some of them claimed that the sessions were also inspiring (F. J., R. B., and M. J. B.). Other students commented about the educational benefits they could get from the feedback through Facebook Live sessions.

“*Mas lalo po kming naiinspire mag aral despite hectic ang sched namin sa 12hr shifting* (It makes us feel more inspired to study despite our hectic 12-hour shift). Thank you for this learning strategy. *Medyo nakakabaliw lng po mag aral ng nag iisa.* (It is driving me crazy to study alone.)” – J. G. C.

“For me, *nakaka wala sya nang anxiety* (For me, it removes anxiety). *Nakaka boost din ng confidence knowing na yung sentiments ko is the same with my classmates* (It also boosts my confidence knowing that my sentiments are the same as my classmates).” – K. F.

“During Facebook Live, *na e-elaborate po ang exams natin at ang module.* (During Facebook Live, our exams and modules are elaborated on).” – R. D. B.

“*Na figure out ko po lahat ng discussion natin sa mga modules na nabasa ko* (I can now figure out all the discussions from the modules that I read). Thanks a lot to FB Live.” – J. A.

One significant disadvantage was verbalized by C. S., who said that Facebook Live consumed a lot of internet data. Others were concerned that the time for interaction was not enough for socialization, so it did not satisfy the tributary benefit of giving feedback through Facebook Live.

## Discussion

The majority of the questions had unanimous answers except for the question about giving negative feedback. There has been a shift in the interpretation of negative feedback in the past few years. Contrary to how the students felt about negative feedback, past educators used it to motivate students. Nonetheless, highlighting shortcomings and finding ways to improve can turn students' perspective of negative feedback into something positive (Hu et al., 2015).

There was an equivocal decision by the respondents on their concern about the feedback itself. This is highly relevant to another research by Hill et al. (2010), which stated that students' perception of feedback and academic standing could be the core of their dissatisfaction.

Literature showed that students could not maximize the potential for learning that they could get through feedback (Jonsson, 2012). Furthermore, in the same article, it was explained that the lack of understanding of academic discourse deterred the effective use of the information given. Over time, students received more erudite orientation on feedback. They considered knowing their grades and ranks essential (Carless, 2019).

The students highly appreciated the collaborative environment. Generally, most, if not all, found feedback through Facebook Live highly useful. The feedback process even became more gratifying because of socialization.

Many of the students appreciated the feedback given through Facebook Live as it became a vessel for them to interact with their faculty and classmates. Another study supported their answers, stating that there should be a shift towards a more dialogic focus on student engagement and the impact of feedback on student learning (Winstone & Boud, 2018).

In a study by Bohnacker-Bruce (2017) which classified the effectiveness of different types of feedback, 65.9% found verbal feedback to students to be more effective than written feedback; conversely, the added condition was that it should be given individually. The respondents also viewed group feedback in a lecture only as quite effective. Given the student diversity in an Open University set-up, however, group feedback using Facebook Live was seen positively by the majority of the respondents.

Carless (2019) noted that students felt ambivalent about the feedback they received and questioned its use and appropriateness to their future. This concern was addressed in feedback through Facebook live as students could immediately verify specific topics or clarify issues as a class.

## Conclusion

Facebook Live as a channel to deliver feedback to students is considered effective. It promotes interaction and allows fast response from educators in case students wish to ask something about a course or clarify certain lessons from a module. The possibility of the Facebook Live to be replayed at the students' convenience also significantly addressed the dilemma of students from different time zones, making it the most appropriate way to deliver feedback to distance learning students. Facebook Live does not only make feedback easy as it also addresses the convenience and interactive aspects. The students saw it as a way to find relief, motivation, and boost confidence. Therefore, a more thorough study on formulating the most efficient method to improve the delivery of feedback through Facebook Live that addresses the concerns of students regarding the length of discussion, ability to interact with all students within a short period is recommended. In addition, the study could also analyse Internet data consumption. Investigation on the impact of feedback given through Facebook Live on student performance and course outcomes would also be vital.

## Acknowledgement

The authors would like to acknowledge Dr. Emma Mulliner and Matthew Tucker for giving us permission to use their questionnaires.

## References

- Adedokun, O. A., Aull, M., Plonski, P., Rennekamp, D., Shoultz, K., & West, M. (2020). Using Facebook Live to enhance and reach of nutrition education programs. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior*, 52(11), 1073-1076.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneb.2020.08.005>.

- Attali, Y. & Van der Kleij, F. (2017). Effects of feedback elaboration and feedback timing during computer-based practice in mathematics problem solving. *Computers & Education*, 110, 154-169. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2017.03.012>
- Boelens, R., Voet, M., & De Wever, B. (2018). The design of blended learning in response to student diversity in higher education: Instructors' views and use of differentiated instruction in blended learning. *Computers & Education*, 120, 197-212. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2018.02.009>
- Bohnacker-Bruce, S. (2017). *Effective feedback: The students' perspective*. Issuu. 26-37.
- Brutus, S., & Greguras, G. J. (2008). Self-construals, motivation, and feedback-seeking behaviors. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 16(3), 282-291. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2389.2008.00434.x>
- Calora, P. & Lleba, Y. (2018). Evaluating the use and acceptance of elearning for tertiary education among senior high school students. *IJODEL*, 4(2).
- Carless, D. (2019). Longitudinal perspectives on students' experiences of feedback: a need for teacher–student partnerships. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 39(3), 425-438. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2019.1684455>
- Colthorpe, K., Liang, S., & Zimbardi, K. (2013). Facilitating timely feedback in the biomedical sciences. *International Journal of Innovation in Science and Mathematics Education*, 2(3), 60-74.
- Crook, A., Mauchline, A., Maw, S., Lawson, C., Drinkwater, R., Lundqvist, K., Orsmond, P., Gomez, S., & Park, J. (2012). The use of video technology for providing feedback to students: Can it enhance the feedback experience for staff and students? *Computers & Education*, 58(1):386-396. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2011.08.025>
- Evans, C. (2013). Making sense of assessment feedback in higher education. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(1), 70-120. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654312474350>
- Gibbs, G., & C. Simpson. 2004. Conditions under which assessment supports students' learning. *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education*, 1(1), 1–31.
- Gray, J., Grove, S., & Sutherland (2017). Burns and Grove's the practice of nursing research. *Appraisal, synthesis and generation of evidence* (8th Edition). Elsevier.
- Han, Y. & Hyland, F. (2019). Academic emotions in written corrective feedback situations. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 38, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.12.003>
- Hill, K., Manotvani, G., & Merrick, D. (2010). Evidence of a disparity between staff and students perception of feedback. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 6(2), 269-274.
- Hu, X., Chen, Y., & Tian, B. (2015). Feeling better about self after receiving negative feedback: When the sense that ability can be improved is activated. *The Journal of Psychology*, 150(1), 72-87. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2015.1004299>
- Jonsson, A. (2012). Facilitating productive use of feedback in higher education. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 14(1), 63-6. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787412467125>

- Kureethara Manuel, A. & Hinchman, T. (2020). Teachers' perspectives on feedback timing. In D. Schmidt-Crawford (Ed.), *Proceedings of Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference* (pp. 2047-2051). Online: Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE). Retrieved October, 21, 2020, from <https://www.learntechlib.org/primary/p/216076/>.
- Lederman, D. (2018). *Online enrolments grow, but pace slows*. Inside Higher Ed. <https://www.insidehighered.com/digital-learning/article/2019/12/11/more-students-study-online-rate-growth-slowed-2018>
- Moldak, M., & Gray, A. (2020). Junior doctor perceptions of education and feedback on ward rounds. *Journal of Paediatrics and Child Health*, 57, 96-102. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpc.15135>
- Montgomery, S., & Groat, L. (1998). *Student Learning Styles and their Implications for Teaching* [CRLT Occasional Papers]. The Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, the University of Michigan. Retrieved October 21, 2020 from [http://career.engin.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/7/2013/06/occ\\_paper10.pdf](http://career.engin.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/7/2013/06/occ_paper10.pdf).
- Mulliner, E., & Tucker, M. (2015). Feedback on feedback practice: Perceptions of students and academics. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 42(2), 266-288. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2015.1103365>
- Orsmond, P., Maw, S. J., Park, J.R., Gomez, S., & Crook, A. C. (2013). Moving feedback forward: Theory to practice. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(2), 240–52. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2011.625472>
- Porcalla, D. (2020). *Philippines internet 'second slowest' in Asean, ranks 110<sup>th</sup> worldwide*. Philstar. <https://www.philstar.com/headlines/2020/12/28/2066612/philippines-internet-second-slowest-asean-ranks-110th-worldwide>
- Safar, A. & Alkhezzi, F. (2016). Students' perspectives of the impact of online streaming media on teaching and learning at the College of Education at Kuwait University. *EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 12(12). 2975-2989. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eurasia.2016.02317a>
- SupportGoogle. (2020). *Google Meet Hardware Requirements*. Support Google.
- Skype. (2020). *How much bandwidth does Skype need?* Microsoft.
- Tso, H. H., & Parikh, J. R. (2020). Using Facebook Live to advocate breast cancer screening. *Journal of Digital Imaging*, 33(4), 1047-1052. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10278-020-00340-2>
- Winstone, N., & Boud, D. (2018). Exploring cultures of feedback practice: the adoption of learning-focused feedback practices in the UK and Australia. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 38(2), 411-425. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2018.1532985>