Investigating the Effect and Students' Perceptions of Using Instagram as a Writing Teaching Tool in Saudi EFL Classrooms
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Abstract
Social media platforms have gained exceptional popularity, especially in the last ten years, and have subsequently become important to current human lifestyle. Instagram (IG) is among the most popular social media platforms, and is used by millions of people every day, especially young adults. Given this significance, social media platforms have been used for educational purposes, too. Thus, this study aims at exploring the perceptions of female high school students about the potential of utilizing IG as a writing teaching tool. Using the Mixed Method Design, thirty-five high school female students learning English as a foreign language were included in the survey with the same students taking part in the experimental part of the study designed to explore the impact of IG on students’ language learning processes. Seven students from the same experimental group were also interviewed for their opinions about IG use. After conducting quantitative and qualitative analyses, the findings show that IG is the most frequently used social media platform among the participants and that they favor it for educational and language learning purposes, especially as a writing teaching tool. Additionally, it was found that IG had a positive impact on the students’ language learning based on their achievement scores. Thus, it is concluded that it can be used to enhance the learning of English supplementary to formal teaching by exposing the students to writing the English language while they are using this platform as part of their everyday practice.
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1. Introduction
Writing appears to be one of the most challenging skills in English Language teaching (ELT) and learning (Handayani, Cahyono, & Widiati, 2018). When working through a variety of tasks in the writing process, students are required to discover ideas to present their writing assignments in a perceptible, comprehensible and tangible way (Gaith, 2002). In order to cope with the complexities and to manage problems in writing, teachers often rely on different pedagogical methods and approaches to teaching writing effectively (Kitchakarn, 2016). In recent times, the advent of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) as well as Social Networking Sites (SNS) has equipped teachers with the skills needed to avail of such valuable tools in teaching methods in order to help learners overcome difficulties related to writing.

1.1 Research Problem
The impact of SNS is visible in the effective deployment of modern-day gadgets, electronic tools and social media applications in ESL/EFL classrooms. From a pedagogical perspective, the teaching of writing skills appears to be a challenging task for ESL/EFL teachers around the world (Handayani, Cahyono, & Widiati, 2018). However, the advent of SNS and electronic gadgets has equipped teachers with skills to reinvent the writing process and use unconventional teaching methods.

1.2 Research Objectives
This proposed study has three main objectives:

1) To explore Saudi EFL learners’ perceptions of the use of IG in their writing lessons;
2) To examine the impact of IG on Saudi EFL learners’ writing skills in their writing classrooms;
3) To identify the strengths and weaknesses of IG as a tool for the teaching of writing in the Saudi EFL context.

1.3 Research Questions

Therefore, this study aims to answer the following three research questions:

1) What are Saudi EFL learners’ perceptions of integrating IG into their writing lessons?
2) Does IG as a teaching tool have any impact on Saudi EFL learners’ writing skills during writing instruction in the classroom?
3) What are the strengths and weaknesses involved in the incorporation of IG as a pedagogical tool to assist in the development of Saudi EFL learners’ writing skills?

1.4 Significance of Study

This study is significant for three main reasons. Firstly, SNS in general and IG in particular, have gained global recognition in academia as they are seen to have a strong impact on both the teaching and learning processes. Due to its overall popularity in ESL/EFL contexts, it is important that all EFL institutes in Saudi Arabia integrate the use of IG in their EFL curriculums to meet learners’ needs in the most enjoyable ways (see Davis, Deil-Amen, Rios-Aguilar, & González Canché, 2015). Secondly, Saudi students, like learners worldwide, frequently use IG for social networking purposes. Hence, the integration of this application in EFL writing lessons can facilitate teachers in their efforts to design activities based on learners’ interests and to add variety to their writing lessons. Finally, writing is a challenging skill to be taught and learned but the use of IG as a mobile learning tool, can make ELT teaching and learning a fun experience.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Emergence of IG in English Language Teaching

IG is essentially more popular among youngsters who are often greatly attached to their electronic devices. It was launched in October 2010 and since then; it has reached more than 400 million users who share photos, videos, and texts every day. Instagram, which is the blend of Insta, meaning instant camera, and gram, referring to telegram, has a number of features that enable its users to create, filter and share live videos and pictures with others (Yuheng, Manikonda, & Kambhampati, 2014). In the field of ELT, IG can be readily used as a source for introducing interactive activities in a language classroom (Handayani, 2016), providing students with authentic learning opportunities to improve their language proficiency.

2.2 Studies on the Use of IG in EFL/ESL Classrooms

Plethora of studies indicates the positive influence of Instagram on language learners’ proficiency, particularly in their writing lessons. Al-Ali (2014) conducted action research to incorporate Instagram as an active e-Learning tool in writing activities in two pre-intermediate/intermediate ESL classrooms. The findings of the study indicate that even though the students did not show enthusiasm at first, they gradually developed an interest and became creative in completing their writing tasks. Similarly, in an experimental study, Listiani (2016) examined the effectiveness of IG writing compared to teacher-centered writing of which the former involved the recounting of text to students of varied motivation levels. The results of the study suggest that recounting text through IG leads to better learning outcomes. In a mixed-method study, Akhiar et al. (2017) examined the perceptions of university students and their attitudes towards the use of IG in English language writing classrooms. In another study focusing on EFL learners, Mansor and Rahim (2017) explored learners’ experiences of using IG to better understand whether its use can motivate them and enhance their interest in classroom activities. The findings reveal that IG had proven to be an effective tool for learner interactions when the participating students were assigned a writing task. In an experimental study, Soviyah and Etikaningsih (2018) investigated the effectiveness of the use of IG to assess learners’ performance in writing descriptive texts. The findings of the study suggest that there was a significant difference in learners’ writing scores between those who were taught using IG and those who did not use it in the classroom. Eraslan (2019) conducted a mixed-method study to explore the perspectives of university students regarding IG being used as an educational tool, and its effect on supplementary language learning. Based on the achievement scores, it was found that IG is revealed to have a positive influence on language learning. Moreover, it was found that it seemingly increases student motivation for writing as learners enjoy the fun involved when checking posts.
2.3 Theoretical Framework

There are three main theories that underpin this research as part of the sociocultural theory: the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), Community of Practice (CoP), and Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). TAM model suits the nature, purpose, scope, and objectives of the study as its major focus is on the use of Instagram—a technological tool to examine its perceived usefulness and apparent ease of use for EFL learners in their writing instruction. Since this study aims to assess the effectiveness of IG as a virtual learning tool in writing lessons, it is important to integrate the characteristics of CoP. Similarly, effective tasks for learners in a writing lesson would definitely require them to interact both formally and informally and attain a level of understanding based on group discussion and feedback received from peers and teachers. Hence, the significance of CoP comes into play as it encompasses the role of teachers as facilitators and learners as collaborators. The key point here is that once learners complete a more challenging task collaboratively, it is hoped that subsequently, less scaffolding would be required as their individual efforts will suffice and their ZPD will have been elevated. For every new task, this process is repeated and the learners’ ZPD is raised.

2.4 Research Gap

In the context of the current research involving the perspectives of Saudi EFL learners, the aforementioned three theories lay a strong foundation to allow for the evaluation of the use of Instagram as a valuable tool to improve their writing skills. Earlier, no any constructive approach has been found that could relate three important theories with a validation to prove the use of Instagram in writing skills of Saudi EFL learners.

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study embraced an illustrative sequential mixed technique plan to gather quantitative and qualitative data and answer the three general project questions. The methodology is likewise called a ‘two-stage sequential plan' that starts with the assortment and then analyze of quantitative information followed by an ensuing collection and investigation of the qualitative responses.

3.2 Research Site and Sample

This mixed-methods study was conducted in a high school in Jeddah, one of the largest cities of Saudi Arabia. The school is a private institution that offers English courses to students of varying levels through a communicative language teaching (CLTA) approach. As this study had a pre-experimental research component, the participants were based in two regular classrooms. There were 16 EFL learners in one class and 19 in the other class. These two classes were considered as one experimental group that was given exposure to IG as a learning tool in writing lessons.

3.3 Research Instruments

This research adopted an explanatory sequential mixed-methods research design. The data collected from the pre-experimental part of the study and the survey questionnaire aimed to answer the first and second research questions. The third research question yielded qualitative data that helped in with more depth to the learners’ perceptions of the use of IG in the Saudi EFL context. For this purpose, 7 semi-structured interviews were conducted with 7 EFL students who also participated in the first phase of the pre-and post-test data collection. According to Dörnyei (2007), semi-structured interviews are often opted for by qualitative researchers as they help them collect enriched and multiple perspectives of a research phenomenon.

3.3.1 Quantitative

The questionnaire was adapted from Handayani et al.’s (2018) study and four items were added, as they were deemed necessary by the researcher. For the validation purpose, a senior language teacher and an experienced researcher in the field of Applied Linguistics were consulted on each item of the questionnaire. Moreover, the questionnaire was piloted to a group of nine students to see if the question items were clear and respondents had no problems understanding them. The survey questionnaire was comprised of 16 questions given in three broad parts: Part 1 was about the learners’ competence in writing and had eight items; Part 2 focused on the EFL learners’ interest in writing lessons and had five items; and part 3 investigated the process of learning with seven items. All the questionnaire items used a four-point Likert-Scale with values: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree. As per the results of the pilot study, all the correlation coefficients range from 0.42 to 0.97, which are considered positive and statistically significant at levels 0.06 and 0.02; however, the correlation of some of the items was statistically insignificant. The final draft of the survey questionnaire seemed to have
high reliability and enhanced validity as all twenty items successfully measured the intended items with the internal consistency of the questionnaire.

3.3.2 Qualitative

For the purpose of this study, the questions were mainly prepared in light of the reviewed literature, the researcher’s personal experience, observation, and the learners’ responses to the survey questionnaire. According to Dornyei (2007), an explanatory design entails the element of ‘retrospective interviews’ with some of the survey participants, using their responses as retrospective prompts for further clarification and open-ended reflection on what they actually mean about certain points (p. 171). The open-ended questions aimed to seek answers to the research questions and authenticated the participants’ scores in the experimental stage of the study and their perceptions about the use of IG as an assistive writing tool in writing lessons. There were 10 interview questions with sub-questions that were very much in line with the aims of the study. The interview questions captured the overall picture of the use of IG from the participants’ perspective and it also adequately addressed the third research question of the study.

4. Data Collection

In the two major stages of this study, quantitative data were collected through a writing test and a survey questionnaire, and qualitative data were gathered through semi-structured interviews with 7 participants. To measure the learners’ existing abilities and current levels of understanding, one writing test was given as a pre-test before the experiment and the second writing test as a post-test was conducted after the intervention. The results of the two tests were compared to determine the learners’ progress and to find an answer to the first research question. While evaluating the students’ paragraphs, the teacher and the researcher worked collaboratively and marked the writing scripts according to the rubric adapted from Jacobs et al.’s (1989) study.

4.1 Ethics Followed

Researcher sought the approval of the school administration to conduct the study on site. The participants’ consent was requested. The consent form was sent to all the participants via email along with a cover letter explaining the purpose and scope of the study. The participants were also informed about the nature and aim of the pre-and post-tests and that their results would not affect their overall grades in summative assessments. It was also communicated to the participants that their identities would not be disclosed, and, for the purpose of confidentiality, pseudonyms would be used instead of their real names in the semi-structured interviews.

5. Analysis of Data

The quantitative data had two major parts: the data collected from pre- and post-tests, and the participants’ responses to the survey questionnaire. For the survey questionnaire, the data were statistically analyzed using the SPSS. The mean and average scores for each item in the questionnaire were displayed in tables, followed by their descriptions. Qualitative data gathered from the semi-structured interviews were analyzed using NVivo software. The software helped in organizing the data for initial coding and resulted in 101 open codes. In the second stage, identical codes were put together to make more sense of the data. Then, identical codes were merged, reducing the number of codes to 65. The third stage reviewed the 65 codes again for similarities to merge them for the purpose of generating categories. This process led to 13 broad categories. In the last stage, similar and closely related categories were merged to create 3 broad themes that aimed to answer the research questions.

5.1 Quantitative

The intriguing IG posts made the students think about the topics, brainstorm ideas and write them in a persuasive way. This was followed by peer-to-peer and group to group feedback sessions that triggered interesting discussions about the IG posts, ultimately leading to learner interest in the writing tasks. The subject of Post (1) was a brainstorming one and it was about agreeing or disagreeing on full dependence on school or teacher to improve English vocabulary to speak better English. Post (2) was about expressing opinion on how far English language is the most important language in the world. Post (3) was a persuasive subject and it was about how often a person drinks coffee and if coffee is bad or good for the body. Post (4) was about students’ views of recognizing different English accents as they study them in school, in order to differentiate between how words are used in English speaking countries. Post (5) was about the COVID-19 vaccine, and how far it is crucial to protect us from the virus, and to what extent we agree with this statement. Post (6) was about teaching informal English and if it should be included in schools or not. All the 35 students responded to these six IG posts by writing their comments, showing a significant improvement every time they write their comments on the posts.
Post (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post I</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean ± SD</td>
<td>Mean ± SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>17.88 ± 3.48</td>
<td>20.62 ± 3.38</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>11.06 ± 2.45</td>
<td>14.56 ± 1.80</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>12.29 ± 3.20</td>
<td>15.74 ± 3.53</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language use</td>
<td>11.79 ± 3.73</td>
<td>15.38 ± 3.75</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>2.21 ± 0.41</td>
<td>3.21 ± 0.41</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding post (1), Table 1 demonstrated that the mean in the post-test contrasted from that in the pre-test. Mean to pre-test (in content criteria) was 17.88, however, mean to post-test was 20.62. Mean to pre-test (in organization criteria) was 11.06, however, mean to post-test was 14.56. Mean to pre-test (in vocabulary criteria) was 12.29, and mean to post-test was 15.74. Mean to pre-test (in language use criteria) was 11.79, and mean to post-test was 15.38. Mean to pre-test (in mechanics criteria) was 2.21, however, mean to post-test was 3.21.

Post (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post II</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean ± SD</td>
<td>Mean ± SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>15.94 ± 3.83</td>
<td>18.71 ± 3.70</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>10.03 ± 3.35</td>
<td>14.62 ± 2.80</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>11.59 ± 2.05</td>
<td>14.76 ± 2.36</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language use</td>
<td>11.65 ± 2.57</td>
<td>14.74 ± 2.65</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>2.09 ± 0.29</td>
<td>3.09 ± 0.29</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding post (2), Table 2 demonstrated that the mean in the post-test contrasted from that in the pre-test. Mean to pre-test (in content criteria) was 15.94, however, mean to post-test was 18.71. Mean to pre-test (in organization criteria) was 10.03, however, mean to post-test was 14.62. Mean to pre-test (in vocabulary criteria) was 11.59, however, mean to post-test was 14.76. Mean to pre-test (in language use criteria) was 11.65, however, mean to post-test was 14.74. Mean to pre-test (in mechanics criteria) was 2.09 and mean to post-test was 3.09.

Post (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post III</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean ± SD</td>
<td>Mean ± SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>17.76 ± 4.49</td>
<td>19.85 ± 3.96</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>12.00 ± 2.87</td>
<td>15.32 ± 2.45</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>12.44 ± 3.39</td>
<td>15.71 ± 3.61</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language use</td>
<td>13.12 ± 3.44</td>
<td>15.74 ± 2.80</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>2.35 ± 0.54</td>
<td>3.32 ± 0.47</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding post (3), Table 3 demonstrated that the mean in the post-test contrasted from that in the pre-test. Mean to pre-test (in content criteria) was 17.76, however, mean to post-test was 19.85. Mean to pre-test (in organization criteria) was 12.00, however, mean to post-test was 15.32. Mean to pre-test (in vocabulary criteria) was 12.44, however, mean to post-test was 15.71. Mean to pre-test (in language use criteria) was 13.12, however, mean to post-test was 15.74. Mean to pre-test (in mechanics criteria) was 2.35 and mean to post-test was 3.32.
Post (4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean ± SD</td>
<td>Mean ± SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>18.62 ± 4.03</td>
<td>21.06 ± 3.86</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>12.97 ± 2.81</td>
<td>16.00 ± 3.06</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>12.62 ± 2.90</td>
<td>15.97 ± 3.18</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language use</td>
<td>12.44 ± 4.24</td>
<td>16.29 ± 4.29</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>2.32 ± 0.53</td>
<td>3.29 ± 0.46</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding post (4), Table 4 demonstrated that the mean in the post-test contrasted from that in the pre-test. Mean to pre-test (in content criteria) was 18.62, however, to mean in the post-test was 21.06. Mean to pre-test (in organization criteria) was 12.97, however, mean to post-test was 16.00. Mean to pre-test (in vocabulary criteria) was 12.62, however, mean to post-test was 15.97. Mean to pre-test (in language use criteria) was 12.44, however, mean to post-test was 16.29. Mean to pre-test (in mechanics criteria) was 2.32 and mean to post-test was 3.29.

Post (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean ± SD</td>
<td>Mean ± SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>20.29 ± 3.39</td>
<td>22.15 ± 2.85</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>13.97 ± 2.49</td>
<td>17.03 ± 2.76</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>14.82 ± 2.59</td>
<td>18.41 ± 2.63</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language use</td>
<td>14.56 ± 4.19</td>
<td>18.26 ± 4.67</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>2.71 ± 0.68</td>
<td>3.59 ± 0.50</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding post (5), Table 5 demonstrated that the mean in the post-test contrasted from that in the pre-test. Mean to pre-test (in content criteria) was 20.29, however, mean to post-test was 19.85. The mean in the pre-test (in organization criteria) was 12.00, however, mean to post-test was 15.32. Mean to pre-test (in vocabulary criteria) was 12.44, however, mean to post-test was 15.74. Mean to pre-test (in language use criteria) was 13.12, however, mean to post-test was 15.74. Mean to pre-test (in mechanics criteria) was 2.35, however, mean to post-test was 3.32.

Post (6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean ± SD</td>
<td>Mean ± SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>19.53 ± 2.81</td>
<td>22.88 ± 2.17</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>15.15 ± 2.78</td>
<td>19.15 ± 3.47</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>15.82 ± 2.37</td>
<td>18.79 ± 2.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language use</td>
<td>15.76 ± 3.74</td>
<td>19.71 ± 4.42</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>2.85 ± 0.74</td>
<td>3.65 ± 0.49</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding post (6), Table 6 represented that the mean in the post-test contrasted from that in the pre-test. Mean to the pre-test (in content criteria) was 19.53, while the mean in the post-test was 22.88. The mean in the pre-test (in organization criteria) was 15.15, however, mean to post-test was 19.15. The mean in the pre-test (in vocabulary criteria) was 15.82 however, mean to post-test was 18.79. The mean in the pre-test (in language use criteria) was 15.76 however mean to post-test was 19.71. The mean in the pre-test (in mechanics criteria) was 2.85 however, mean to post-test was 3.65.

5.2 Qualitative

The results gathered from the qualitative thematic data analysis to view interview responses have elaborated to three major subjects associated to research questions 1, 2, and 3. These themes are: “The impact of Instagram on Saudi EFL learners’ writing skills,” “Saudi EFL learners’ perceptions of integrating Instagram into their writing
lessons,” and “The strengths and weaknesses of using Instagram as a pedagogical tool in writing.” In light of these three themes, many related subthemes are noticed.

5.2.1 The First Research Question
Does Instagram as a teaching tool have any impact on Saudi EFL learners’ writing skills during writing instruction in the classroom?

During this active research, positive performance has been illustrated in content and language use due to the students’ ordinary use of the recent themes and familiar languages on Instagram. For example, one of the students declared “I like to post on Instagram in English…I think it is cool.” Most of the participants argued that using Instagram is engaging as it is an attractive platform that uses interesting visual elements. Besides the easy use of the platform, one of the students mentioned it was enjoyable: “Instagram is my favorite social media app.”

Content and Language Development
Concerning the “content” and “language use,” there has been clear development due to it being a fun and familiar way for learning. The students’ performance in reading, especially in the areas of “content” and “language use” has been exceptional as they have utilized a certain “content” and “language” familiar in their common daily use of Instagram. In this context, one of the students mentioned “Instagram helps me to write proper English which enables me to convey my thoughts and messages better.”

Saudi Teaching Community and Mobile Phones
Saudi Arabia is a rich country and illustrative of this, most students use the latest version of mobile phones. In addition, the Kingdom uses up-to-date technology, especially in education. Here, mobile phones pave the way for modern learning tools that Saudi school curriculums, teachers, and teaching approaches must follow. Consequently, using social media platforms, especially Instagram, can suit the educational Saudi system. However, some students reject these platforms for moral considerations as one of the students explains: “I do not like Instagram. It has inappropriate pictures and my parents said that this program presents inappropriate contents.”

In addition, it is worth reiterating that mobile phones pave the way for modern learning tools that Saudi school curriculums, teachers, and teaching approaches must adapt to. In other words, mobile phones are a part and parcel of every young person’s daily life, so it must be integrated in the process of education (Drigas & Charami, 2014; Kamilah & Anugerahwati, 2016).

5.2.2 Second Research Question
What are Saudi EFL learners’ perceptions of integrating Instagram into their writing lessons?

Feedback
Feedback is regarded as one of the most important elements in the pedagogical process. It helps students to understand more about their performances. Giving and receiving feedback in the present study asserts the role of social media platforms, especially Instagram, as a tool in writing lessons. In this context, one of the students stated: “Immediately our teachers gave us the marks and corrected our mistakes. It was an interesting practice.” Moreover, Instagram, as an educational tool, has utilized very effective ways for providing feedback through comments, DM(s), or the automatic proofreading powered by the app, or by the phone.

Motivation
In spite of the efforts made either on the local level, or on the international level. Many students find writing lessons uninteresting. Thus, it is necessary to create motivation for these lessons. This motivation can be made through producing an encouraging environment that empowers students to communicate with greater audiences from different countries. Consequently, using Instagram as an educational tool in writing has created a strong motivation for writing, as most students agree. One of the students mentioned: “I hated English. It was a boring subject, especially writing classes, but using Instagram in writing is very enjoyable. I wait for the English class for this interesting practice.”

All the participants mentioned that they feel ease to rectify their partners’ sketch displayed to IG. Unlike other methods of assessing writing, the samples clarified that their classmates’ response assisted them.

5.2.3 Third Research Question
What are the strengths and weaknesses involved in the incorporation of Instagram as a pedagogical tool to assist the development of Saudi EFL learners’ writing skills?
Strengths to Use Insta – (Pedagogical Tool) to Write

The incorporation of Instagram as a pedagogical tool in writing has illustrated very acceptable success. This method has created motivation for students through attributing interesting and amusing approaches in writing. In addition, using Instagram as an educational tool removes the stress that has always been an obstacle in writing lessons as per one student’s comment: “It looks like a game. It is very funny and cheerful.” Moreover, the approaches through which feedback is performed are very creative. Using comments and DM(s) instead of common tools of editing and feedback makes the feedback more interesting and useful. In addition, the visual element in Instagram supports writing skills. One of the participants remarked “the illustrations are very attractive…Instagram helps me a lot to write better.”

The weaknesses of using Instagram as a pedagogical tool in writing

In spite of the development shown in students’ writing, some problems have been highlighted in to use Insta for academic writing. Some learners reject the use of social media platforms. Moreover, not all students can use technology. In this regard, one of the students mentioned: “I love to use Instagram to post and view videos and photos. However, I do not like to use technology in learning.” In addition, some students reject Instagram as an educational tool for moral considerations as mentioned earlier. Furthermore, some grammar and spelling problems are noticed as the students do not use handwriting: handwriting is more familiar than keyboard writing. In this regard, one of the students commented: “My dad was very angry and wondered how my grammar and spelling mistakes could be noticed.” Here, it is worth mentioning that “pen and paper” as a technique of writing enhance students’ memories, especially grammar and spelling memory. Moreover, some participants mentioned that they do not generally use English for posting their Instagram photos and videos, for commenting as they prefer to use Arabic.

The present study emphasizes some additional strength such as IG as motivator, as assessor, and as an audio-visual tool of learning.

6. Limitations

Sample of project have one group of students and 35 participants in total. For the quantitative part of a study, it is better to recruit a larger number of participants to have more reliable and generalizable results. Hence, future researchers can include more participants and conduct studies that will address this limitation. Secondly, the participants are only female students in a private school; hence, the perspective of male students would have yielded more interesting results.

7. Conclusion

To sum up, using Instagram as a pedagogical tool in enhancing writing skills has shown very positive results. The utilized approach has highlighted good results concerning writing creativity, vocabulary, and language use. In addition, as the app depends on both audio and visual representation, it represents a very effective audio-visual tool for enhancing writing skills for students. It also motivates students’ writing skills due to its interesting and interactive interface.

Concerning feedback, IG, as a pedagogical tool, has produced very effective ways for providing feedback through comments, DM(s), the automatic proofreading powered by the app, or by the phone. However, using Instagram as a pedagogical tool has highlighted some weaknesses including certain writing problems involving grammar, spelling, punctuation, and capitalization. In addition, using social media, in general, and IG, in particular raises many questions about the ethics of using such platforms as pedagogical tools.
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