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Abstract: The aims of the recent study were; analyzing the effect of creative and online learning using Instagram on the ability to create new products in the technology and learning media course, and determining the level of users’ experience in processing visual media through the Canva application on android. Quantitative approach with this research was carried out through a quasi-experimental research model because it measured the post-test was applied to 58 students as the respondents in two experimental and control classes. This study used two instruments; the cognitive learning outcome questionnaire according to the subject to get the students’ ability to create new products, and the second instrument was taken from ueq-online.org in the Indonesian version to know the users’ experience in processing visual media. The data were analyzed using one-way ANOVA, mean and standard deviation assisted by IBM SPSS Statistics 24.0. The results demonstrated that the effect of creative and online learning using Instagram on the ability to create new products in The Technology and Learning Media course was found significant at 0.028 <0.05 which meant it could be applied well. Meanwhile, the level of users’ experience in processing the visual media application Canva on Android had the highest score on the Stimulation scale at 1.59, categorized "Very Good" and the lowest score was on the Novelty scale at 0.93, categorized "Above Average". With the strong creative encouragement to create new products, the students were able to process their own visual media which were tailored to the agreed digital visual designs and were published on Instagram.
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Introduction

Learning in the 21st century includes creativity (Newton & Newton, 2014), it is considered as the core thinking skill of the 21st century, but many people hesitate to identify themselves as "creative" (Henriksen et al., 2017), including creative learning which enable learning process to direct all aspects of students’ abilities in learning to support education because there is a relationship between education and creativity (Daniel, 2001). Creativity in students is a part that encourages learning abilities in supporting learning, namely creativity and learning (Jeffrey & Craft, 2004). Creative learning is important in supporting education and learning at all levels of education (Tanggaard, 2014).

Creative learning will create students who are also able to create many new findings in the learning process, both in the community and in small environments such as small classrooms at school (Amponsah et al., 2019); provide new learning directions for students in class with special practices that stimulate the ability to create new favorite things (Ellis, 2016); guide to pay attention to all aspects of creative learning design (Cochrane & Antonczak, 2015), in the form of creative learning through social media using cellular devices and redesigning the curriculum around the students produced in m-portfolios. Furthermore, Mayer (1989) explained, creativity in learning occurs when students use...
learning strategies actively to represent new material mentally which leads to transfer the problem solving that supports a view of cognitive creativity.

However, the research experimented to four different groups by Yeh et al. (2020) entitle "Beliefs towards Cellular Devices for Learning Creativity" found that not all learning process in higher education is created into creative learning which direct students' potential to the positive direction, their research also claimed that processing visual media will create creative students. Because every child has a creativity, not only those who are gifted or very intelligent (Runco, 2003), developing criteria to measure the creativity and spatial specific ability domains in education is significant (Cho, 2017), moreover, students show creative activity when they work regularly with professionals in their schools (Heath & Wolf, 2005).

Processing visual media is a creative activity and the teachers play an important role in providing a conducive classroom environment for creative learning (Esquivel, 1995). Jónsdóttir (2017) claimed that fostering creativity is such a complex undertaking, it is characterized by several factors that can be adjusted and influenced. According to Davies et al. (2013) there are some factors that support the creativity skills development in children and adolescents; the flexibility in using space and time, the existence of suitable materials, and the teaching and learning process outside the classroom/school.

Besides visual media, processing audio-visual media such as learning videos can be used to support creative learning. Toyn (2008) provided responses from the students who valued their experience and develop a desire to use digital video in their own classroom practice to support meaningful learning by making digital videos to be the powerful tool in supporting creative teaching and learning. This finding was also supported by an essay from Jeffrey (2008) entitle 'Studio Thinking: A Model of Artistic Mind, the role of new technologies in creative learning and calculation of creative learning' which revealed current perspectives of the policy on creativity in education and the perspectives of artists on art practice and pedagogy.

Visual media and visualization have long been measured and researched, in the form of a Verbalizer-Visualizer Questionnaire at post-test and a 3 weeks follow-up to the 53 junior high school students in the certain program to reduce interpersonal anxiety (Warren & Good, 1979). A careful revision was also conducted for the challenging goal by the better modeling process of human visual information (Diamant, 2008). Park et al., (2020) stated that the process of visual information can be measured by eye movement, subjective perceived cognitive, and memory performance, but did not affect the knowledge performance or information transfer found, however, this study emphasized more on visual media processing, students formulation, planning and producing visual media and were published on social media Instagram. Another similar study was also conducted by Sadik (2009) and investigated the impact of utilizing social media 'Flickr', hosting community, and sharing photos online on visual literacy skills of pre-service teachers.

Likewise for online learning, according to Martin et al., (2020), the students have been ready for online learning which is measured by interest and confidence in their abilities. In addition, the use of multimedia in designing a course has a positive contribution to the student performance or their perceptions of online learning experiences (T. Davis & Frederick, 2020). Tekin et al. (2020) added, the right and suitable model for online learning was a flipped classroom model for learning interactive multimedia content because the flipped model is suitable for self-efficacy (Kinteki et al., 2019), Julia et al. (2020) also examined the flipped classroom model articles which have been published in some well-known international journals from 2010 to 2019. Because this topic discussed online learning that has been applied all over the world, studies and publications about flipped cere increasing in line with the findings of flipped learning which is appropriate to be part of online learning.

Online learning with social media has also been popularly used, such as Facebook (Jumaat et al., 2019), YouTube for interesting learning (Jenkins & Dillon, 2013; Lee & Lehto, 2013; Salehudin, 2020), also for Instagram, it can also be used for interesting learning because it has interactive or streaming functions, today, Instagram is even the world's third-best social media with a growing number of users. In Indonesia, there are about 100 million users of Instagram and dominated by adolescents and college students. Young people like using Instagram as a global social media among them (Jang et al., 2015; Kertamukti et al., 2019), Instagram for learning (Salehudin, Hamid, et al., 2020), Instagram as the most reliable visual function (Hochman & Manovich, 2013; Zappavigna, 2016), Instagram for creative learning of graphic design lesson (Salehudin et al., 2019).

Therefore, the ability of students to process visual media is an instrument for developing and fostering the potential to create new products which as the students' learning creativity in technology and learning media (Giaoglio & Jessica, 2014; Marsh et al., 2017), the ability to process visual media as an art of creativity development (Ulger, 2016), thus enabling the research on the users' experience in processing visual media for interesting learning.

Users' experiences in processing technology-based or android applications visual media is a form of technological development that supports all human activities including teaching and learning activities, all art activities, music, DIY, and even all social medical activities (Prattichizzo, 2015), interpreting subjectivity of Instagram images (Zappavigna, 2016), the Instagram users' experiences to learn graphic design (Salehudin, Hamid, et al., 2020), multimedia users'
experiences and Instagram posts based on visual image features (Mittal et al., 2017) and social media that can be used for learning (Aljuboori et al., 2020; Hussein & Hussain, 2019; Liu, 2010; Thalluri & Penman, 2015).

There was a number of studies on social media for teaching and learning, specifically Instagram for learning, but no research has been done on the users’ experience in processing visual media for the students’ publication as well as the students’ outcomes in creating new products in teaching and learning to support creative learning, whereas, the visual media in Instagram can be used as a media for online learning which has been widely used around the world. So it is interesting for this current research to raise the key questions about how online learning through Instagram with visual media as the outcomes of students’ cognitive “creating new products” in creative learning, and the second question is about how the users’ experiences in processing visual media using the Canva application android to support creative learning.

**Methodology**

**Research Goal**

The aims of this study; first is analyzing the effect of online learning using Instagram on the ability to create new products with creative learning in the technology and learning media courses, second is determining the level of users’ experiences in processing visual media through the Canva application on android in online learning via Instagram.

![Figure 1: Research Design and Data Collection](image)

Exactly, this research was carried out through a quasi-experimental research model because it measured the post-test (Creswell, 2012). Participants were categorized or placed in two class groups, experimental class and control class, post-test was administrated to both groups but the treatment was only given to the experimental class, the procedure is as follows:

| Class       | Meeting | X1 = Creative learning (experimental treatment) | X2 = Problem Based Learning (PBL) |
|-------------|---------|------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Experimental Class | R       | -------------------Experimental Class---------O | X1Q                               |
| Control Class   | R       | -------------------Control Class---------O       | X2                                |

All participants of the recent study were the fifth-semester students of IAIN Samarinda in 2019-2020, Faculty of Education in the Technology and Learning Media subject. Using a random sampling design, 58 students were divided into two classes, 29 students for the experimental class and 29 students for the control class, were assigned a random sample in this study. Both conventional class and control class used project-based learning without treatment. This conventional class used only internet-based visual media in general; no special treatment was given for Canva visual media using Android and Instagram.

This research collected quantitative data which were obtained from short answers from some tasks; consequences and benefits, tasks to formulate, designing and producing; students were asked to create new products according to certain specifications which include ways for students to design new digital visual media products with the Canva android application provided on all students’ Android phones in online learning during this research.

The validity of the test was carried out on all item questions consisting of indicators for formulating, designing, and producing. Those three indicators were spread into 36 question items and successfully validated into 30 question items. The validity of the instrument was determined by looking at the score obtained is less than r table, which was 0.3338, then the items were categorized as invalid. looking at the Corrected item-total Correlation column based on the results of the test instrument validation test, there were six invalid question items, those were question items no. Q3, Q6, Q11, Q14, Q16, Q23, which can be seen in the following table:
Table 2: Instrumental Test Validity Test Results

| Item | Mean if Item Deleted | Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item Total Correlation | Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted |
|------|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Q 1  | 27.06                | 62.761                   | .411                            | .928                            |
| Q 2  | 26.86                | 62.303                   | .544                            | .926                            |
| Q 3  | 26.71                | 64.504                   | .327                            | .928                            |
| Q 4  | 26.83                | 61.852                   | .638                            | .925                            |
| Q 5  | 26.86                | 62.361                   | .535                            | .926                            |
| Q 6  | 26.91                | 64.081                   | .266                            | .929                            |
| Q 7  | 26.86                | 61.950                   | .596                            | .925                            |
| Q 8  | 26.97                | 62.087                   | .515                            | .926                            |
| Q 9  | 26.69                | 63.339                   | .638                            | .926                            |
| Q 10 | 26.83                | 61.734                   | .656                            | .925                            |
| Q 11 | 26.97                | 65.087                   | .124                            | .931                            |
| Q 12 | 26.83                | 63.558                   | .378                            | .928                            |
| Q 13 | 26.86                | 62.361                   | .535                            | .926                            |
| Q 14 | 26.77                | 66.123                   | .006                            | .931                            |
| Q 15 | 26.86                | 62.361                   | .535                            | .926                            |
| Q 16 | 26.80                | 64.400                   | .267                            | .929                            |
| Q 17 | 26.83                | 61.734                   | .656                            | .925                            |
| Q 18 | 26.83                | 62.499                   | .538                            | .926                            |
| Q 19 | 26.77                | 62.358                   | .630                            | .925                            |
| Q 20 | 26.77                | 63.770                   | .391                            | .928                            |
| Q 21 | 26.86                | 62.361                   | .535                            | .926                            |
| Q 22 | 26.83                | 61.734                   | .656                            | .925                            |
| Q 23 | 26.89                | 64.339                   | .239                            | .929                            |
| Q 24 | 26.86                | 64.067                   | .488                            | .929                            |
| Q 25 | 26.77                | 62.358                   | .630                            | .925                            |
| Q 26 | 26.86                | 61.597                   | .648                            | .925                            |
| Q 27 | 26.80                | 61.694                   | .698                            | .924                            |
| Q 28 | 26.83                | 62.734                   | .502                            | .926                            |
| Q 29 | 26.80                | 61.635                   | .707                            | .924                            |
| Q 30 | 26.83                | 61.617                   | .674                            | .925                            |
| Q 31 | 26.83                | 62.558                   | .529                            | .926                            |
| Q 32 | 26.77                | 61.829                   | .720                            | .924                            |
| Q 33 | 26.83                | 62.734                   | .502                            | .926                            |
| Q 34 | 26.80                | 63.812                   | .359                            | .928                            |
| Q 35 | 26.77                | 61.829                   | .720                            | .924                            |
| Q 36 | 26.83                | 62.734                   | .502                            | .926                            |

Table 3: Instrument reliability test results

| Cronbach’s Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| .928             | 36         |
| .940             | 30         |

Based on the results of the calculations as seen in the table above, it was known that in the beginning, the reliability of the question items was 36 items with the Cronbach’s alpha was 0.928, after the invalid items were discarded and only 30 valid items remained, the Cronbach’s alpha was 0.940.

Data Analysis

Quantitative data were analyzed using mean, standard deviation, percentage, and test of One-Way ANOVA. The data were previously checked by Normality Testing using Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk assisted by the IBM SPSS Statistics 24.0 for Windows program to test the section on creating new products for the course of Technology and Learning Media in online learning using Instagram.

The data of users' experiences in processing the Canva application's digital visual media were analyzed using statistical analysis and was carried out online at www.ueq-online.org with clear and valid benchmarks (Schrepp et al., 2017) has accuracy in analysis and has been used by more than 20 world countries, using the User Experience Key Performance Indicator (UX KPI) (Hinderks et al., 2019).
Research Instrument

To measure the effect of creative and online learning on the students’ ability to create new products, the study used questionnaires constructed based on the topic of the subject. The questionnaires were also used to collect closed responses from students. The questionnaires consisted of 30 statements, 20 positive statements and 10 negative statements and were tailored to three stages; problem description, solution planning, and solution execution. Those three stages were the creation of new products containing three cognitive processes; formulating, planning, and producing. The questions in this study were developed from the topic of learning materials in the technology and learning media courses which consisted of three scales; the formulating scale with 7 positive questions and 3 negative questions (the ability to find ideas and concept in visual design), the planning scale had 6 positive and 5 negative questions (the ability to plan designs, layouts, and the procedure in visual design) then for the production scale with 7 positive questions and 2 negative questions (processing designs, product discussions, evaluating and reprocessing new ones from the evaluation results).

The users’ experiences; User experience instrument to measure the use of Canva as a medium to process visual media, were measured using an instrument from www.ueq-online.org which has been translated into Indonesian consisted of 26 question items and 6 measurement scales: Attractiveness, Perspicuity, Efficiency, Dependability, Stimulation, and Novelty.

Normality Test

The normality test showed the significance value at Kolmogorov-Smirnov for Formulating solution was 0.099, the Planning solution was 0.069, and the value of producing new products was 0.194. Significance at Shapiro-Wilk for formulating a solution of 0.262, planning a solution of 0.069, and producing a new product of 0.060. In short, the significance value of each data is greater than >0.05, which meant, the research data was in a normal distribution, The normal data showed that it can be continued for the One-way ANOVA test. The data of the normality test result can be seen in the table below:

| Creating new products | Kolmogorov-Smirnov\(a\) | Shapiro-Wilk |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------------|
|                       | Statistic | df | Sig. | Statistic | df | Sig. |
| Formulating           | .149      | 29 | .099 | .956      | 29 | .262 |
| Planning              | .156      | 29 | .069 | .934      | 29 | .069 |
| Producing             | .134      | 29 | .194 | .931      | 29 | .060 |

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

While the average of the test results and standard deviation of the users’ experiences in processing digital visual media using Canva Android is shown in the following table:

| Scale          | Mean  | Std. Dev. | N  | Confidence | Confidence interval |
|----------------|-------|-----------|----|------------|---------------------|
| Attractiveness | 1,342 | .937      | 58 | 0.241      | 1,101- 1,583        |
| Perspicuity    | 1,384 | .975      | 58 | 0.251      | 1,133- 1,634        |
| Efficiency     | 1,155 | .983      | 58 | 0.253      | 0.902- 1,408        |
| Dependability  | 1,263 | 1,005     | 58 | 0.259      | 1,004- 1,522        |
| Stimulation    | 1,595 | 1,153     | 58 | 0.297      | 1,298- 1,891        |
| Novelty        | 0.935 | 0.931     | 58 | 0.240      | 0.696- 1,175        |

Of the six scales to determine the experience of Canva users in processing visual media, the Attractiveness scale gets an average score 1,342, Perspicuity1,384, Efficiency 1,155, Dependability 1,263 Stimulation 1,595 and for the Novelty scale of 0.935, with a low value interval of 0.696 and the highest 1.175.

Findings/Results

The research results on the creative learning with online learning through Instagram to find out the ability to create new products for students in the class of Technology and Learning Media found that the average score was 86.64, producing score at 88.17, planning score at 88.03, and the lowest and a bit far different was formulating score at 83.72,
Table 6: Descriptive calculation of the mean and standard deviation

| Score       | N  | Mean  | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | 95% Confidence Interval for Mean | Lower Bound | Upper Bound | Min. | Max. |
|-------------|----|-------|----------------|------------|---------------------------------|-------------|-------------|------|------|
| Formulating | 29 | 83.72 | 7.076          | 1.314      | 81.03 - 86.42                   | 70 - 96     |             |      |      |
| Planning    | 29 | 88.03 | 7.433          | 1.380      | 85.21 - 90.86                   | 70 - 98     |             |      |      |
| Producing   | 29 | 88.17 | 6.580          | 1.222      | 85.67 - 90.68                   | 76 - 98     |             |      |      |
| Total       | 87 | 86.64 | 7.259          | 0.778      | 85.10 - 88.19                   | 70 - 98     |             |      |      |

After getting the descriptive results of mean and standard deviation tests in terms of creating new products, it was found that the homogeneity test result of variants was greater than > 0.05, which means that the value of creating the new products was in the homogeneous category with the significance score 0.870.

Table 7: Homogeneity of Variance Results

| Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|------------------|-----|-----|------|
| .139             | 2   | 84  | .870 |

From the test results of one-way ANOVA, it was found that all aspects tested were lower than <0.05 with the significance value of 0.028, meaning that the data was significant, so it can be concluded that the average score of the three stages in creating new product was significantly different. The ANOVA calculation results are as follows in the table:

Table 8: One-way ANOVA calculation results

| Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F    | Sig. |
|----------------|----|-------------|------|------|
| Between Groups | 371.057 | 2 | 185.529 | 3.745 | .028 |
| Within Groups  | 4160.897 | 84 | 49.534 |      |      |
| Total          | 4531.954 | 86 |        |      |      |

\[ n^2 = \frac{\text{Treatment Sum of Squares}}{\text{Total Sum of Squares}} \]

\[ n^2 = \frac{371.057}{4531.954} \]

\[ n^2 = 0.081 \]

The result of the calculation showed a significant number of p value <0.028 and it was smaller than alpha 0.05, (p<0.05). It can be concluded that the post-test scores for creating the new product were significantly different.

Regarding the users’ experiences in processing visual media using Canva Android, the average score of all items of the questions can be seen in the table below:

Table 9: Confidence Intervals for Items and Scales

| Item | Mean | Std. Dev. | N  | Confidence | Confidence interval |
|------|------|-----------|----|------------|---------------------|
| 1    | 1.466| 1.158     | 58 | 0.298      | 1.168 - 1.764       |
| 2    | 1.897| 1.071     | 58 | 0.276      | 1.621 - 2.172       |
| 3    | 1.034| 1.486     | 58 | 0.383      | 0.652 - 1.417       |
| 4    | 1.293| 1.487     | 58 | 0.383      | 0.910 - 1.676       |
| 5    | 1.638| 1.683     | 58 | 0.433      | 1.205 - 2.071       |
| 6    | 1.517| 1.188     | 58 | 0.306      | 1.211 - 1.823       |
| 7    | 1.828| 1.126     | 58 | 0.290      | 1.538 - 2.117       |
| 8    | 1.224| 1.364     | 58 | 0.351      | 0.873 - 1.575       |
| 9    | 0.724| 1.322     | 58 | 0.340      | 0.384 - 1.064       |
| 10   | 0.207| 1.565     | 58 | 0.403      | -0.196 - 0.610      |
| 11   | 1.707| 1.284     | 58 | 0.331      | 1.376 - 2.037       |
| 12   | 1.586| 1.451     | 58 | 0.374      | 1.213 - 1.960       |
| 13   | 1.483| 1.203     | 58 | 0.310      | 1.173 - 1.792       |
| 14   | 1.552| 1.046     | 58 | 0.269      | 1.283 - 1.821       |
| 15   | 0.966| 1.376     | 58 | 0.354      | 0.611 - 1.320       |
| 16   | 1.603| 1.154     | 58 | 0.297      | 1.307 - 1.900       |
| 17   | 1.086| 1.328     | 58 | 0.342      | 0.744 - 1.428       |
From table 9 above, there were the results of the average value and confidence interval were in all parts of the user experience question items. This result was then processed into an alpha value and becomes a benchmark value.

The results of each item of users’ experience test on the six scales of UEQ-Online can be seen in the Cronbach’s Alpha-Coefficient table below:

| Item | Mean | Std. Dev. | N | Confidence | Confidence interval |
|------|------|-----------|---|------------|---------------------|
| 18   | 1.397| 1.611     | 58| 0.415      | 0.982 – 1.811       |
| 19   | 1.034| 1.184     | 58| 0.305      | 0.730 – 1.339       |
| 20   | 1.414| 1.077     | 58| 0.277      | 1.080 – 1.782       |
| 21   | 0.862| 1.420     | 58| 0.365      | 0.497 – 1.227       |
| 22   | 1.431| 1.365     | 58| 0.351      | 1.080 – 1.782       |
| 23   | 1.052| 1.317     | 58| 0.339      | 0.713 – 1.104       |
| 24   | 1.103| 1.224     | 58| 0.315      | 0.788 – 1.418       |
| 25   | 0.862| 1.420     | 58| 0.365      | 0.497 – 1.227       |
| 26   | 1.534| 1.112     | 58| 0.286      | 1.248 – 1.821       |

In table 11 above, it can be seen that the value on each alpha value scale was above > 0.07 (Cronbach’s alpha coefficients).

The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient is a measurement for the scale consistency. There is no rule which is accepted generally on the coefficient score. Many authors assume that a scale should show an alpha value> 0.7 in order to be sufficiently consistent, but these are only the practical rule and not based on the statistical facts. Thus, from the standpoint of methodological, the use of such criteria is not really well-founded. Especially for the small sample (for example less than 50 answers) the score of the Alpha-Coefficient should be interpreted very carefully. In such cases, a low Alpha can result from sampling errors and may not be an indicator of the scale problem.

If the score of the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient shows a massive nonconformity from a sensible target value, for example, 0.6 or 0.7, can be because some items of the scale were interpreted mistakenly. In such cases, make sure to...
check every single item score and the correlations between the items. A common misinterpretation of an item due to the context of the evaluation might happen, that is why there should be a very careful interpretation on the corresponding scale.

To support the findings of this study about the users’ experiences in processing digital visual media using the Canva android application were categorized as “above average, good, and very good”. See the following graphic image:

![Figure 2: Benchmark of the Users’ Experiences in processing Visual Media](image)

The above graph in Figure 2 was the finding of research from the calculation of each item score. The following table shows the findings of the average test results more clearly:

| Scale       | Mean | Comparison to benchmark | Interpretation                                           |
|-------------|------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| Attractiveness | 1.34 | Above average           | 25% of results better, 50% of results worse             |
| Perspicuity | 1.38 | Above Average           | 25% of results better, 50% of results worse             |
| Efficiency  | 1.16 | Above Average           | 25% of results better, 50% of results worse             |
| Dependability | 1.26 | Above Average           | 25% of results better, 50% of results worse             |
| Stimulation | 1.59 | Excellent               | 10% of results better, 75% of results worse             |
| Novelty     | 0.94 | Above Average           | 25% of results better, 50% of results worse             |

From table 11 above, the average result of the Novelty scale was 0.94 with a benchmark comparison of Above Average, followed by the Attractiveness scale 1.34, Perspicuity 1.38, Efficiency 1.16, Dependability 1.26, only the Stimulation scale with an average of 1.59 with a benchmark comparison of Excellent.

Creating new products produced in learning was all students’ works through formulating, planning, and producing. The example on the [https://www.instagram.com/p/CGHZomQpjMZ/?igshid=1rq08sx0gajpu](https://www.instagram.com/p/CGHZomQpjMZ/?igshid=1rq08sx0gajpu) account was the creation of a new visual product of the students which created using Canva and uploaded on Instagram. See the following image:

![Figure 3: The results of students’ new products in visual media learning- Instagram](image)
The processing and production steps to create the new visual media products with Canva, starting by learning topics, developing learning media, classroom learning assignments, an experimental treatment using the Canva application to process visual media, and as a result, students will create new products to the utmost, the learning steps can be seen in the following table:

| No | Category/Indicator | Other Names | Result | Media |
|----|-------------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| 1  | Formulating       | Making Hypothesis | Students looked for ideas/concepts and quick as well as best ways to create visual media designs with Canva, including text, colours, images, layouts | Canva dan Instagram |
| 2  | Planning          | Designing   | Students planned the steps and stages of a new product | Canva |
| 3  | Producing         | Constructing | Students created new products of Canva visual media with Android and uploaded/published their work to Instagram | Canva - Instagram |

Discussion

Among the three stages of creating new products, producing new products was the greatest with the significance value greater than > 0.05 both in the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and in the results of the Shapiro-Wilk Tests. A clear image of the results can be seen in the QQ Plots image as follow:

![Figure 4: Detrended Normal Q-Q Plots](image)

The test results of with One-Way ANOVA for the data of creative and online learning using Instagram on the ability to create new products, it was found that all items tested were below <0.05, the ANOVA calculation result with a significance value of 0.028 smaller than < 0.05 means that the data was significant. It can be concluded that the average score of the three stages in creating the new product was significantly different. From the three assessment components in three cognitive sections of creating (Anderson, 2001); formulating, planning, and producing new product, the creating item was at the highest level.

The effect of creative learning using Instagram, students find ideas in the process of formulating work, ideas must be found and become the basis of a job in visual media design and students will create new products that are uploaded or published their best work via Instagram, thus all student creativity always appears, so the role of and the use of Instagram in this case serves as an idea discovery until publishing their new product. Because these students always play and use Instagram, on the students' ability to create in the Technology and Learning Media course in the cognitive category had a significantly different value. This proved that in the classroom environment (maintaining creativity in the classroom), the environment of learning is one of the most important factors-determined largely whether creative potential will be supported (or suppressed), in short, class context matters. Recognizing that the classroom environment has an impact on the creative potential development is important, but understanding what is needed to develop a creative learning environment that optimally supports creative learning is also important (Beghetto & Kaufman, 2014). Creative learning factors in supporting the creative skills development in children and youth: the flexibility in using time and space; the existence of suitable materials; the teaching and learning process outside the
Different from this research, another research investigated the creative process, interactive visual analytics differs from other forms of digital creativity, because it uses an analytical model, depending on the mental image of the analyst and involves the repeated process of generating and evaluating ideas in digital media, as well as planning, implementing, and refining the related actions (Cybulski et al., 2015). Other researchers absorbed on the use of smartphones for learning creativity and provided a valid instrument and smartphone-based awareness method for learning creativity everywhere (Yeh et al., 2020). Learning by doing is passed in adolescents' school and out-of-school literacy practices deliver a good starting point for experts and educators who are keen to redesign learning chances that are more viable in the digital media age (Tan & Kim, 2015).

Online learning (Davis, 2004) using Instagram can be applied in online learning through social media and e-learning and applied simultaneously in distance learning conditions. Social media has been effective for online learning (Jenkins & Dillon, 2013; Ogbonnaya, 2019; Zha et al., 2016), as e-learning in online learning has been implemented in almost all countries, in Thailand with good e-learning management (Vichanpanya, 2014), that there is a generally positive impression among students about social media, there is also a great interest and increasing use of these social media for academic use (Aljuboori et al., 2020), online learning is applied in the Covid-19 pandemic era (Adnan & Anwar, 2020). With many proper learning models in online learning today, blended learning using social media (Romadhon et al., 2019) blended learning (Nortvig et al., 2018) using flipped learning (Elfeky et al., 2020; Julia et al., 2020; Kinteki et al., 2019; Tekin et al., 2020).

New media that provide support for learning activities (Lee & Lehto, 2013), providing the support that the developed-learning media is effective in improving the learning quality in multimedia learning with students studying multimedia progressions, beforehand and afterward using e-learning of Edutech Smart (Suartama et al., 2020) multimedia for learning for professional teacher education (Salehudin, Nurbayani, et al., 2020).

The level of users’ experiences in processing visual media through the Canva android application on online learning through Instagram with an average score of test results on six scales; Attractiveness 1.34, Perspicuity 1.38, Efficiency 1.16, Dependability 1.26, Stimulation 1, 59, the Novelty 0.94. The highest score was on the Stimulation scale at 1.59 which was categorized as "Very Good" while the lowest score was the Novelty scale at 0.94 which was categorized "above average".

The users’ experiences showed that the students who processed digital visual media through the Canva Android application found convenience and stimulation and those were very meaningful for their enthusiasm in processing visual media that will be published on Instagram. This result is supported by many users’ experience studies, such as the results of user experience research by (Park et al., 2011; Pucillo et al., 2014).

Instagram is a medium to publish the new products of the students' masterpiece, that is digital visual media products. In line with the current research, Zappavigna, (2016) conducted the research on the use of social media Instagram, to learn graphic design which showed the value of learning outcomes (Salehudin et al., 2019), although there were a lot of previous researches on Facebook and YouTube (Chintalapati & Daruri, 2017; Moghavvemi et al., 2018), the current research suggested that Instagram can be effectively used as an online learning tool.

Conclusion

There not much research has been done on creative and online learning using visual media through Instagram, so it is interested in doing this research to find new contributions of knowledge to the world, especially in the world of education and learning in Indonesia. Conventional learning does not combine the use of the latest media with media that are easily found and liked by students, Instagram is a social media used by all teenagers and students around the world today.

Creative and online learning using Instagram on the ability to create new products in technology and learning media course is significant and can be applied well. The ability to create is a strong boost from creative learning carried out with visual media through Instagram, students like this practice considering the easiness to process visual media through the Canva Android application and it can be directly published on Instagram. Instagram can be used for online learning because it has some supported tools such as streaming, IGTV, visual worksheets, comment boxes, and stories storage sheets. Instagram fosters positive encouragement for students who learn creatively. Whereas for the users' experiences level in processing visual media through the Canva application on Android, the highest score was on the Stimulation scale of 1.59 or "Very Good" and the lowest score was Novelty 0.94 which categorized "Above Average". This means that by the strong creative encouragement to create, the students were able to process the new products which were tailored to the agreed design, particularly the design which were appropriate to the template of Instagram, including all capabilities on the six scales of users' experiences.

Recommendations

The researchers of current research recommend higher education institutions to use social media Instagram as a device option for online or distance learning because Instagram has supported tools for teaching and learning activities.
Instagram has been favored by students around the world as the best social media and it has also been well available on all students’ Android. Creative learning can support online learning well if it is developed with other variables such as visual or verbal skills in using Instagram for online learning probably using Visual Verbal questionnaire instrument. We recommend for future research to look at moderating variables with attitudes, or behavior of Instagram users for online learning, also research on the development of creative learning designs with Instagram, and evaluation of learning through Instagram.

Limitations
Creative and online learning using visual media through Instagram, as well as user experience processing Instagram digital visual media are limited to:

- The visual media processing application is the Canva application on Android which needs a computer or mobile expedient.
- It is required passable internet access.
- Online learning using Instagram streaming and publication of student work on Instagram.
- Limited to the digital visual media processing materials based on Instagram as the social media.
- Assessment of learning results in this study is incomplete to the cognitive aspect of "creating".
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