

FROM PEDAGOGY TO PRACTICE: LECTURERS' EXPERIENCES OF MULTILITERACY PEDAGOGY INTEGRATION IN 21ST-CENTURY TERTIARY EFL CLASSROOMS

Anak Agung Putri Maharani^{1*}, Ni Wayan Adi Priantini²
Universitas Mahasaraswati Denpasar, Denpasar, Indonesia

*Corresponding email: aamaharani@unmas.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The rapid advancement of digital technology in the 21st century has fundamentally transformed the landscape of English language teaching and learning, demanding a shift from traditional print-based literacy instruction toward more dynamic, multimodal approaches. Despite growing scholarly attention to multiliteracy pedagogy as a framework for addressing diverse communicative practices in digital learning environments, limited research has examined how lecturers actually experience and enact this pedagogical shift in their everyday classroom practice. This study, therefore, aimed to explore the lecturers' lived experiences in integrating multiliteracy pedagogy into 21st-century tertiary EFL classrooms. Employing a qualitative research design, this study involved six purposively selected EFL lecturers who had experience incorporating multiliteracy pedagogy in their instruction. Data were collected through in-depth structured interview and document analysis, and were subsequently analyzed using thematic analysis. The findings revealed that while the lecturers demonstrated strong conceptual awareness of multiliteracy pedagogy. Nevertheless, the lecturers developed adaptive strategies to bridge the gap between theory and classroom practice, reflecting their professional commitment to 21st-century literacy instruction. This study contributes to the growing body of literature on multiliteracy pedagogy by offering contextually grounded insights that inform professional development programs, curriculum reform, and policy-making in tertiary EFL settings.

Keywords: multiliteracy pedagogy; EFL lecturers; tertiary education; and 21st-century literacy

1. INTRODUCTION

The 21st-century has brought about significant changes to the concept of literacy. As a result of the explosion of digital technology in society, it is evident that the concept of literacy has changed once again. More specifically, the rise of new forms of digital media has led to the need for individuals to develop new skills and knowledge to become literate in the 21st - century (Cope & Kalantzis, 2023; Lim et al., 2022). The idea of multiliteracies originated with the New London Group in 1996 as a means of accounting for both the diversity within present-day societies as well as the digital media technologies that are available to individuals in the present day.

The developments in EFL education are especially relevant in this context. With the rapid change in how people communicate using language, as well as the changing nature of how a

language will be used in the future, lecturers need to provide EFL students with the means to become proficient in traditional language skills (e.g., speaking, reading) and developing the skills necessary to navigate more difficult text and communicate in multimedia terms (Veliz et al., 2024; Jiang and Hafner, 2024). EFL learners in tertiary level environments have a unique opportunity at this time of change, as tertiary level students are increasingly likely to engage with discipline-specific literacies that require an integration of digital tools, visual communication, and critical media literacy. Recent research indicates that multiliteracies pedagogy can help meet these needs of EFL learners in tertiary environments; results from studies that utilized multiliteracies pedagogy in tertiary EFL environments showed significant improvements in autonomy, critical thinking, and communicative competence (Dewi et al., 2025; Priego and Carcamo, 2025).

Located on a set of four key components: situated practice; overt instruction; critique framing; and transformed practice (New London Group, 1996), multiliteracy pedagogy is founded on four main aspects: situated practice, overt instruction, critical framing and transformed practice. The framework has undergone major updates and innovations from its original form through its initial creation. Cope & Kalantzis (2023) once again reaffirmed that multiliteracies has relevance in today's digital world, serving as an impetus for educational justice by validating the way that learners create multiple meanings in a variety of settings will create opportunities for students' diverse views of knowledge and value as learners in their education. Current research has also significantly expanded this framework by including translanguaging strategies/approaches into multiliteracies frameworks, showing how multiliteracies and translanguaging intersect to create pedagogies that allow for more inclusive and agentic modes of creating meaning as opposed to utilizing only monomodal and monoglossic meaning creating technique/strategies (Veliz, Wong, 2025; Wang et al., 2025).

Even with its solid theoretical basis, there is still a huge gap between theory and practice in regards to implementing multiliteracies in the classroom. Recent studies of EFL lecturers using multiliteracy pedagogy through online higher education systems reported that although lecturers use a variety of multimodal strategies and have incorporated critical thinking activities into their lessons, scaffolding has been particularly difficult to achieve in a virtual environment (Richardson, 2024). This demonstrates an ongoing conflict between what is thought to be ideal according to the multiliteracies framework and what actually happens in the teaching and learning process, and the conflict is exacerbated by institutional constraints, limitations of the physical environment, and inconsistent access to professional development opportunities. Additionally, Green (2025) provided critical insight at a systemic level through a systematic review of the literature on multiliteracies; he stated that while there has been almost 30 years worth of advocacy for multiliteracies, very little experimental evidence from research studies has been produced that show that multiliteracies pedagogy directly improves student's literacy abilities. This therefore reinforces the call for further qualitative inquiry regarding multiliteracies in practice.

The importance of lecturers as agents of change in the way they teach is central to understanding how multiliteracies are taught in a real classroom. Studies on lecturers

professional development through multiliteracies have consistently shown that lecturers have a gap between their understanding of multiliteracies and how they teach them (Paesani & Allen, 2020; Loerts & Belcher, 2024). A longitudinal study completed by Loerts and Belcher (2024) found that educators need both classroom experience and dedicated time for professional learning through reflection in order to successfully transition from knowing about multiliteracies to delivering instruction with them in an intentional, creative way. This study supports additional research on EFL teachers' proficiency in using digital tools, where lecturers who are more digitally literate will implement more student-centered, multimodal methods of instruction than teachers who are less digitally literate. Current studies on teacher education and multiliteracies confirm that education programs must prepare teachers to deliver instruction using multiliteracies through cultural, social, and educational contexts of the populations served.

The development of multiliteracy pedagogy and its relationship to contemporary educational technology, including generative AI, is an emerging area of concern. Zeng and Yu (2025) by virtue of their research found that in a multiliteracy framework, EFL students who interacted with AI-assisted portfolio evaluation exhibited a continuum of development from passive learning to pro-active learning, accompanied by progressive development in both multimodal awareness and metacognitive skills. Additionally, developing and supporting educators' adoption of place-based digital composing practices has clear potential in terms of supporting professional growth while acilitating a transition from superficial uses of technology toward more transformative pedagogical designs that align with multiliteracy principles (Wang et al., 2025). These advances in multiliteracy pedagogy indicate that its boundaries are still developing based on the capabilities and constraints of an increasingly AI-mediated educational environment.

There is considerable research on multiliteracies and multiliteracies pedagogy, but research conducted in high-income countries or other western contexts is still greatly outnumbering research in lower-income, non-western contexts. Much of the existing research that does examine multiliteracies in non-western contexts is focused on either curriculum design or on learner outcomes. These studies leave us with an insufficient understanding of how lecturers working in higher education institutions in developing countries and other non-western settings experience and navigate multiliteracies pedagogy in their everyday professional lives. Thus, there is an immediate need for qualitative research that will provide us with insights into the perspectives of lecturers. Since lecturers serve as the bridge between the pedagogical ideals espoused at the level of policy and the reality of the classroom, this is essential to understanding how multiliteracies pedagogy will be interpreted, negotiated, and implemented by lecturers under real conditions of institutional constraint. If we do not understand how lecturers are interpreting, negotiating and implementing multiliteracies pedagogy under 'real' conditions in their institutions, we will not be able to promote any curriculum reform or professional development initiatives that are grounded in actual practice.

This study is an exploration of the lived experiences of lecturers with multiliteracy pedagogy integrated into 21st-century EFL classrooms at the tertiary level. Its aim was to investigate how lecturers implement multiliteracy pedagogy in their classrooms. In this way, this study provides insights rooted in the experiences of EFL lecturers that may be useful in developing professional development programs, curricula reform and policy at the tertiary level.

2. METHODOLOGY

The qualitative research approach employed a qualitative method in order to determine how EFL instructors have integrated multiliteracy into their educational implementation of multiliteracy in their education context. Since this study sought to discover qualitative meanings and experiences of those involved in multiliteracy through qualitative methods, the use of qualitative research was the most appropriate method because the qualitative method allows for measuring data qualitatively but does not measure quantitatively (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Additionally, since the results of these studies are similar in the use of qualitative methodology to further develop multicultural methods, the quantitative purposes of the previous studies of teacher multicultural methods allow these types of studies to have the same emphasis on qualitative methods of exploration as they do on the numerical success of those methods (Richardson, 2024; Loerts & Belcher, 2024). Six EFL lecturers were purposefully chosen because each of them has experience in using multicultural pedagogy within the pedagogical context used in each participant's classroom. Purposeful selection was made to ensure that each participant has direct knowledge of the phenomenon being researched and has had personal experience using multicultural pedagogy (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). In alignment with qualitative studies, purposeful sampling was implemented in qualitative studies to provide information and evidence for qualitative studies (Veliz & Nguyen, 2025).

The researcher used two tools to collect data: interview and documentation. Structured interviews were used by the researcher to obtain specific descriptions of the lecturers' experiences using multiliteracy pedagogy (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Additionally, by analyzing the semester course plan, handout, learning contract, and the students' work, the researcher obtained more evidence to confirm what was collected during interviews and to show how multiliteracy principles were demonstrated in the lecturers' formal teaching texts (Bowen, 2009). Interview and document analysis were applied with the multiliteracy component (New London Group, 1996) and knowledge process (Kalantzis & Cope, 2005; Yelland et al., 2008; Cloonan, 2010; Rowland et al., 2014) as guidance. Thematic analysis was employed to analyze the collected data using Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase framework. This method permitted the identification, organization, and interpretation of themes present within the dataset of data collected from the analysis to illustrate specific themes of the conceptual awareness, the practical challenges faced, and the adaptive strategies of lecturer during use of multiliteracy pedagogy within 21st-century tertiary informant-instructed EFL class during this study.

3. RESULTS

The following section presents the findings from structured interviews conducted with six EFL lecturers (L1–L6) and document analysis results across four courses. Responses were analyzed thematically, with each of the eight interview questions yielding two to four recurring themes. For each question, a narrative analysis is followed by the thematic evidence drawn directly from respondents' accounts.

Question 1 Connecting Students' Prior Experiences with Reading Texts

According to the findings, all six of the participants in the study shared a constructivist approach to linking student experiences to current reading experiences; however, each had different strategies for doing so. A main theme that arises from the data is the activation of prior knowledge through discussion and reflection. These findings can be validated by the following scripts.

"I start by helping students recall what they already know about a text type. Then, I invite students to connect readings to their own lives." (L1)

"I activate students' prior knowledge through pre-reading activities such as guided discussions and reflective questions, allowing them to connect their personal, cultural, and academic experiences with the texts." (L2)

"I usually connect my students' prior knowledge by starting to elicit my students' prior knowledge through reflection and discussion." (L6)

A second theme relates to the use of digital technologies as bridges from pre-existing knowledge; for example, L3 used interactive tools like Mentimeter and Padlet to have students provide information about varying kinds of knowledge they had regarding a given topic or subject. These findings can be validated by the following script.

"I use digital tools such as Mentimeter and Padlet to encourage students to share what they already know about a topic or text type, allowing me to identify their prior knowledge and link it to the current material." (L3)

The third theme relates to making connections of past reading experiences to new assignments. L4 activates prior knowledge by making direct comparisons of previous readings with new readings, and L5 provides course sequencing where students relate their experience in a previous paragraph writing course to their current essay writing course. These findings can be validated by the following script.

"I connect students' prior experiences by activating their background knowledge before introducing new materials and then comparing the current text with texts they have read." (L4)

"I just asked my students about what they have learned in their previous writing lesson in the last semester. After that, I relate the experiences that they share to the new task." (L5)

Question 2 Introducing Students to New or Unfamiliar Reading Texts

Respondents largely agree that the first step to introducing students to unfamiliar texts is providing them with structured preparation, though there are differing amounts of dependence on providing scaffolding support either through instructional modelling, textual scaffolding, or digital mediation as a way of properly introducing the texts. The strongest agreement across respondent groups was on the need to engage with structured scaffolding prior to introducing new texts. The evidences can be seen in the following scripts.

"I introduce unfamiliar texts by providing background information, key vocabulary, and contextual scaffolding, including examples of similar genres and multimodal features." (L2)

"I introduce students to new or unfamiliar reading texts by providing structured scaffolding to build students' readiness through reading aloud, discussing the topic, finding unfamiliar words, and comprehending the context of the text." (L4)

Second, a theme that emerges is the explanation of the purpose of the text and modelling how to read the text. L1 introduced the text to students by explaining that it had a purpose, and also showed how to approach meaning within the text through a cognitive process of reading and thinking about what was written. Additionally, L6 provides modelling examples of reading and analysing other texts and then provides a sequential method for students to analyse the structure, language features, and purpose of the text. The evidences can be seen in the following scripts.

"I start by briefly explaining the purpose. Then, I model how to read it; I mean how to approach the meaning delivered by the text." (L1)

"I first model exemplar writing and then guide students to analyse the structure, language features and purpose of the exemplar writing followed by a gradual process of scaffolded practice tasks." (L6)

The third theme provides a discussion of using digital platforms and multimedia for text introduction. The evidences can be seen in the following scripts.

"I begin by providing context about the text type often supported by visual or multimedia examples. I use digital platforms such as Padlet to guide questions to elicit students' predictions and initial responses regarding text purpose, structure, and key features." (L3)

"I usually have my own PowerPoint, video, and some examples of the essay writing genres that I am going to teach/introduce. I introduce the genre in a very simple way, by explaining its structure and the purpose and also the language features." (L5)

Question 3 Supporting Students in Developing Reading Strategies

Within these responses the development of strategies is always addressed through explicit instruction. The most common theme shared among the examples is the teaching and modeling of reading strategies. The findings can be proven by the following scripts.

"I directly teach the students what strategy should be used to comprehend the text. I also show students how the author's way of thinking when writing the text." (L1)

"I support strategy development by explicitly modelling reading strategies, such as identifying main ideas and making inferences, followed by guided and independent practice." (L2)

L3's response highlights a consistent, overarching theme related to using structured reading frameworks, including CSR, RAP, jigsaw reading, and PQ3R. All of these research-based strategies require students to engage with the text actively, and L3 further enhances those strategies by providing a collaborative digital platform for students to highlight, annotate and share their understandings in real time. The findings can be proven by the following scripts.

"I apply strategies such as CSR, RAP, jigsaw reading, and PQ3R where students actively engage with the text. I use collaborative platforms to allow students to highlight, comment, and share their interpretations in real time." (L3)

Another consistent overarching theme is the use of gradual scaffolding (with guiding questions) of comprehension strategies for use with students, which was seen in L4's and L6's responses. The findings can be proven by the following scripts.

"I provide scaffolding through guiding questions and simplifying the content of the texts." (L4)

"I support the process with prompts, models, and feedback and organize the activities into distinct steps: planning, drafting, revising, and editing." (L6)

L5 also described a group-based approach using collaboration through the roundtable process of completing both the reading and writing processes. This can be supported by the following script.

"For the first writing practice I usually formed a group, like roundtable, and they discuss with their group while using the writing process from planning, drafting, revision." (L5)

Question 4 Using Multimedia Resources to Enhance Reading Comprehension

All of the people surveyed use multimedia for teaching but they use it differently in terms of its placement in the lessons and the pedagogical objective for the resource. One theme in this area, using videos, images, and infographics to create a context for students before reading, is particularly evident in L3. Like L3, L5 uses multimedia as a means to facilitate the organization of students' ideas and helps them develop their ideas. The findings can be proven by the following scripts.

"I use short videos to introduce the topic and activate background knowledge. I also incorporate infographics to simplify complex information and help students identify key ideas and relationships visually." (L3)

"I usually use Story Jumper, Google Docs, video, and images. These simple tools help the students to generate their ideas, organize their writing, and able to receive feedback easier." (L5)

The second theme is the use of electronic/digital formats to provide students with opportunities to engage in project-based learning. This theme can be proven by the following scripts.

"I set my reading class in project-based learning; it is mostly in the form of digital portfolio (Canva e-book and PDF). So, the students freely choose kind of reading sources based on the instruction and the task for each meeting." (L1)

"I always use digital texts about current issues but relate to the topic, so that they are not only learning about literal reading but also elevating their knowledge." (L4)

One principle found in both/discussed by all the designs is the promotion of multimodal digital literacy through the use of multimedia as a tool for engaging students in creating meaning using multiple modes/tools (L2). As well, L2 describes a complete/multi-modal multimedia environment (their collaborative digital writing, visuals, and online interactive feedback)/interaction as being fully based on the principles of multiliteracies and digital literacy (L6) throughout. The findings can be proven by the following scripts.

"I integrate multimedia resources, including videos and digital texts, to enrich context, support comprehension, and engage students in multimodal meaning-making." (L2)

"Multimedia tools include digital platforms to engage in collaborative writing, adding visual aids (e.g., images, infographics, videos) to develop the idea, and feedback via online tools that is interactive." (L6)

Question 5 Guiding Students to Analyze Text Purpose, Meaning, and Structure

When analyzing texts, all of the participants approached this process as a methodical and intentional teaching strategy where the tools and approaches to scaffolding for analysis were different between participants. The first theme is the use of guiding questioning strategies or graphic organizers to complete text analysis, with the largest variance in using questioning as the primary analytical scaffold (L1), leading students to independently arrive at a conclusion versus the use of graphic organizers along with guiding questions and collaborative digital tools (L3) as part of a more structured scaffolding technique. The findings can be proven by the following scripts.

"I guide them by asking questions and let them find it by themselves." (L1)

"I begin by providing guided questions and graphic organizers to help students break down the text systematically." (L3)

The second theme was modeling text analysis through the gradual release of responsibility. The findings can be proven by the following scripts.

"I guide students through structured analytical tasks, using guiding questions to examine the purpose, meaning, and organizational structure of the texts." (L2)

"I guide students through scaffolding by modeling text analysis, providing guided instruction, and gradually reducing support to promote their independent reading skills." (L4)

The third most common theme of critical thinking strategies and text mapping was best illustrated by L5 and L6 in their approaches to text analysis. The findings can be proven by the following scripts.

"I tell them to answer some questions to themselves about why, how, and what evidence support their ideas. I also tell them to use mind maps to outline their ideas." (L5)

"I urge students to engage in critical thinking by ensuring that they follow techniques like outlining, mind mapping, and questioning techniques so as to assess the relevance and coherence of their arguments." (L6)

Question 6 Encouraging Students to Evaluate Credibility, Relevance, and Perspective

All respondents report that teaching students to make critical evaluations of texts is an explicit instructional goal, although they express this goal through a variety of different theoretical emphases. The first theme, using students' own real-life contexts to evaluate the text, is illustrated by L1, who carefully selects texts that relate directly to students' everyday lives so as to make the criteria for evaluating an abstract construct of credibility more tangible and personally relevant. The findings can be proven by the following script.

"I always ask them to relate/associate the reading text with their daily life. At first, I choose texts that really close/relate to my students' daily life." (L1)

The second theme, teaching students to apply strategies for reading critically as well as identifying bias in texts, consists of L2 and L3 demonstrating much higher degrees of analytical sophistication. The findings can be proven by the following scripts.

"I encourage critical evaluation by prompting students to assess the credibility, relevance, and perspective of texts, including identifying bias and comparing multiple sources." (L2)

"I introduce criteria such as author authority, publication source, evidence provided, and potential bias. I also use checklists and guiding questions to help students assess whether a text is reliable and relevant." (L3)

The third theme, critically evaluating sources through discussion and justification, is represented by the activities L4 and L6 use to require students to provide justification for their evaluation by either discussing their specific reasons for the evaluative judgments they have reached, or by having them structure source selections around the criteria relating to

credibility, relevance, accuracy, and currency. The findings can be proven by the following scripts.

"I engage students in discussion and reflection activities that encourage them to justify their evaluations and think critically about the information they encounter based on the text." (L4)

"Students evaluate and choose sources by using credibility, relevance, accuracy, and currency criteria, usually with checklists and model examples guiding them." (L6)

The fourth theme is about verifying the authenticity and reliability of digital and academic sources of information, and is represented by L5 directing students to reputable academic online databases. The findings can be proven by the following script.

"I always tell them to make sure that the website where they read or download the sources are reliable. I tell them to find journal articles/research results from eric.gov.id or from other journal articles that they find in Google." (L5)

Question 7 Students' Creative Responses to Reading Texts

Overall, the research findings suggest that when asked how they respond to texts, the respondents place importance on responding to texts in a variety of ways (beyond just with written responses). They emphasized the forms of creative responses via visual, interactive, and personally reflective ways most highly-based on creativity, interaction, and subjectivity. The first theme (Creative responses through visual and multimodal products) showed the strongest evidence in L1 and L3. The findings can be proven by the following scripts.

"Students take ideas from a text and express them in a different form, such as infographic, table, poster, etc." (L1)

"I integrate creative tasks such as digital storytelling, visual summaries, and short video responses, allowing students to represent their understanding beyond written text." (L3)

At an even higher degree of strength for L2 and L4, the second theme (Collaborative discussion and oral presentation) includes both oral presentation and collaborative discussion as modes of response so students are able to communicate their understanding of a text and their perspectives critically. The findings can be proven by the following scripts.

"Students respond to texts through collaborative discussions and oral presentations, allowing them to express understanding and critical perspectives." (L2)

"I encourage them to participate in interactive discussions where they share interpretations, ask questions, and connect the text to their own experiences." (L4)

The third theme (Personal reflection and original written response) regarding students engaging in reflective daily writing response or connected creative writing drafts, as found in L3 and L5, demonstrates that personal writing did not just reflect a degree of creativity in

writing but was also connected to their previous writing experiences. The findings can be proven by the following scripts.

"I facilitate discussions and reflective responses where students share their interpretations, relate the text to their own experiences, and express their opinions." (L3)

"To know whether their ideas are genuine or not, I usually not allowing them to use AI or using the sentences from an article; they need to use their own sentences by paraphrasing the text from the sources that they get." (L5)

Question 8 Reinterpreting and Re-presenting Ideas from Reading Texts

The last item asked to what extent all respondents agree that reading comprehension should go beyond just being able to understand something they read, but also to be able to actively reconstruct and re-present the ideas they have read. Transforming texts into visual or multimodal representation was the most frequently cited (across respondents) theme reflecting common post-reading activity. Both L1 and L3 describe this in terms of how students create infographics, tables and posters to represent ideas they have found in a text. In L1, lecturers require that students to represent information visually through infographics, tables and posters, while L3 designs tasks for students requiring active reconstruction of information using infographics, short videos, role-play scenarios, and/or rewriting from the viewpoint of another perspective. The findings can be proven by the following scripts.

Students take ideas from a text and express them in a different form, such as infographic, table, poster, etc." (L1)

"I design tasks that require students to reconstruct information, such as summarizing texts into infographics, creating short videos, role-playing scenarios, or rewriting texts from different perspectives or contexts." (L3)

Paraphrasing, summarizing and reformulating the ideas from a text would be the second most common theme, represented predominantly by L2 and L5. The findings can be proven by the following scripts.

"Students reinterpret ideas by transforming information into alternative formats, such as summaries, visual representations, or presentations in different contexts." (L2)

"They read it, understand it, paraphrase it, or summarize it. They also revise the grammar and structure of their writing." (L5)

The third most common theme found across both L4 and L6 was the idea of presenting and transferring information across various settings. The findings can be proven by the following scripts.

"Students present their insights through presentations, discussions, and summarizing the idea of the text." (L4)

“Strategies like paraphrasing, summarizing, and reorganizing ideas to meet various purposes and audiences with the assistance of guided feedback and peer review are often used to make students revise or transform their writing.” (L6)

Table 1. Summary of the Key Findings based on Interview

No	Stage	Dimension	Theme
1	Situating Practice / Experiencing	The Known	a. Activating prior knowledge through discussion and reflection b. Using digital technology as a bridge to prior knowledge c. Linking previous reading experiences to new tasks
		The New	a. Structured scaffolding before engaging with new texts b. Explaining text purpose and modeling how to read c. Using digital platforms and multimedia for text introduction
2	Overt Instruction / Conceptualizing	Scaffolding	a. Explicit teaching and modeling of reading strategies b. Applying structured reading frameworks (CSR, PQ3R, Jigsaw, RAP) c. Gradual scaffolding with guiding questions d. Collaborative group-based learning
		Multimedia	a. Integrating videos, images, and infographics as pre-reading context b. Using digital platforms for project-based tasks c. Multimedia for multimodal and digital literacy learning
3	Critical Framing / Analysing	Reason	a. Guiding questions and graphic organizers for text analysis b. Modeling text analysis with gradual release of responsibility c. Critical thinking strategies and text mapping
		Evaluation	a. Connecting texts to real-life contexts as a basis for evaluation

			b. Teaching critical reading strategies and identifying bias c. Critical source evaluation through discussion and justification d. Verifying digital and academic source reliability
4	Transformed Practice / Applying	Innovation	a. Creative responses through visual and multimodal products b. Collaborative discussion and oral presentation c. Personal reflection and original written expression
		Reconstruction	a. Transforming texts into visual or multimodal formats b. Paraphrasing, summarizing, and reformulating textual ideas c. Presenting and transferring ideas across contexts

The results of document analysis support the findings from the interview, demonstrating a consistent approach to teaching multiliteracies in the classroom. The design of each course incorporates prerequisites into its curriculum and allows for increasing complexity in academic literacy skills as the course progresses. In addition to utilizing prior knowledge to support students' current level of understanding, the Handbook and Semester Course Plan outline the transition from basic comprehension (identifying vocabulary, identifying main idea and specific details) to advanced skills (interpreting implicit meaning and analyzing text). The Learning Contract confirms this consistency by articulating a structured set of outcomes that will be achieved as students' progress through a staged writing process, which also illustrates the systematic support of learners at each stage of the instructional process.

Moreover, the use of digital tools to facilitate learning, as mentioned by the lecturers in their interviews, is well represented in the course documents by the use of tools such as Google Classroom, and interactive quizzes: these represent the multimedia nature of learning. Lastly, both data sources demonstrate that students are required to justify their answer and participate in peer review activities; however, whereas the lecturers of the courses stressed the need for higher-order application, it appears that the quantity and quality of the students' responses indicate that their practices have not fully been transformed. Additionally, while students are performing well in relation to the levels of comprehension and organization, they are performing relatively poorly in terms of innovation and reconstruction of

knowledge, indicating that they have progressed only partially through the different stages of advanced multiliteracies.

Table 2. Summary of the Key Findings based on Document Analysis

No	Stage	Dimension	Identified Tasks
1	Situated Practice / Experiencing	The Known	a. Identifying familiar vocabulary and meanings b. Recognizing general and specific information in texts a. Connecting text topics with prior knowledge
		The New	a. Interpreting implicit meaning b. Applying scanning and skimming strategies c. Engaging with new academic genres (argumentative writing, research background)
2	Overt Instruction / Conceptualizing	Scaffolding	a. Guided reading tasks (e.g., reading logs) b. Step-by-step essay construction c. Lecturer-guided discussions and peer review
		Multimedia	a. Online reading and comprehension tasks b. Digital submission (Google Classroom) c. Interactive quizzes (Quizizz)
3	Critical Framing / Analysing	Reason	a. Distinguishing explicit vs. implicit information b. Justifying answers with textual evidence c. Developing logical arguments in essays
		Evaluation	a. Peer-reviewing essays b. Evaluating text credibility and meaning. c. Reflecting on reading comprehension
4	Transformed Practice / Applying	Innovation	a. Writing argumentative essays b. Creating reading logs with interpretation c. Producing original academic texts
		Reconstruction	a. Paraphrasing and summarizing texts b. Synthesizing multiple sources

			c. Writing research background based on issues
--	--	--	--

4. DISCUSSION

Interpret results and link to previous studies. This research revealed that lecturers of English as a foreign language (EFL) engage in multiliteracies pedagogy through four interdependent stages identified by the New London Group (1996): Situated Practice (examples of real-world contexts), Overt Instruction (methods of teaching), Critical Framing (ways of looking at what is taught), and Transformed Practice (adoption of new literacy practices). This article will highlight how the findings presented previously correspond to theoretical frameworks and findings from more recent studies.

The Situated Practice framework for literacy development is based on the students' previous knowledge and experiences. All six lecturers of this study activated the students' previous knowledge before beginning new material to align with schema theory (Anderson & Pearson, 1984), which asserts that reading comprehension is influenced by what readers have previously learned. Pre-reading discussions and reflective questioning have improved reading comprehension by making background knowledge explicit (Spires & Donley, 1998) in both L1 and L2. The use of Mentimeter and Padlet by L3 was an extension of this practice and reflects research that collaborative digital media are effective mediators for accessing prior knowledge in communication-rich environments (Kukulska-Hulme et al., 2021; Cope & Kalantzis, 2015). L4 and L5 used intertextual comparisons between texts and course sequencing strategies that are consistent with genre-based pedagogy (Hyland, 2007) and Vygotsky's (1978) notion of ZPD. The document analysis supports the concept of an intentional progression within the curriculum from recognition of familiar vocabulary to interpretation of implicit meaning and engagement with academic genres.

The intent of Overt Instruction is to teach students how to use language and think about their thinking through explicit, systematic instruction (Cope & Kalantzis, 2015). All lecturers implemented direct instruction using strategy like modeling comprehension; for example, the explicit use of identifying main ideas and making inferences is supported by substantial research on how direct instruction improves academic performance (Pressley & Afflerbach, 1995). L3 used structured, interactive frameworks (RAP and Jigsaw) that engage students in active reading with texts and demonstrate their effectiveness in EFL contexts (Klingner & Vaughn, 1998). L3 also provided collaborative digital annotation platforms for students based on a sociocultural model for constructing meaning—Vygotsky (1978)—and developed twenty-first-century digital literacy skills (Lankshear & Knobel, 2011). L3 and L5 used videos and infographics as pre-reading supports in accordance with cognitive theory of multimedia learning (Mayer, 2009). Notably, L1 digital portfolios created using Canva integrate authentic digital literacy (New London Group, 1996) and document analysis provides confirmation of institutionalization of these professional practices within Google Classroom and Quizizz platforms.

Through Critical Framing, the students should be encouraged to analyze and evaluate different texts based on the social, cultural and ideological contexts of those texts. According to New London Group (1996), L1 and L3 used graphic organizers as well as Guided Questions that had been shown to scaffold abstract thinking while making the structure of each text visible. L1's inquiry-based questioning method (Barron & Darling-Hammond, 2008) and L4's gradual release of responsibility model (Pearson and Gallagher, 1983), both provide evidence of scaffolded support for students to become independent readers. At a more advanced level, L2 and L3 provided instruction on locating bias within different pieces of text and comparing the biases from multiple sources, both of which are components of critical information literacy according to Elmborg (2006). L3 helped students develop the lateral reading skills that are increasingly being emphasized in today's curriculum through the use of evaluation checklists. L5 also refers to ERIC as being an example of how to demonstrate an understanding of the conventions of disciplinary discourse (Hyland, 2002). Although there are indications in the documents regarding critical framing tasks being addressed within the curriculum, students did not perform well in these areas, suggesting that the curriculum does not provide adequate opportunities for students to get the repeated practice they need in order to internalize these skills (Freebody & Luke, 1990).

5. CONCLUSION

This study investigated the ways that the lecturers are using the multiliteracies approach to language learning through the four connected elements of multiliteracies: Situated Practice, Overt Instruction, Critical Framing and Transformed Practice. The findings show that the lecturers have been successful at motivating their students by using their previous experience, incorporating multimedia technologies into lessons, and providing direct, strategic guidance; however, the lecturers have not yet fully discovered or utilized the final two elements: Critical Framing and Transformed Practice. On the other hand, all of the students demonstrated good comprehension skills and were able to organize their ideas; however, they needed assistance to create innovative ideas and critically evaluate information before making new meanings from the same information and applying them to other situations.

In conclusion, the lecturers have not yet fully incorporated multiliteracies throughout all four levels of instruction for their students and should give students more direct lessons that support students in critically evaluating sources, generating new ideas and creating multimodal products. Further, professional development for the lecturers should concentrate on helping lecturers create tasks that develop students' advanced literacy skillsets. In addition, more research is needed to explore the perspectives of students to gain greater insight into what multiliteracies look like in EFL environments.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, R. C., & Pearson, P. D. (1984). A schema-theoretic view of basic processes in reading comprehension. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.), *Handbook of reading research* (pp. 255–291). Longman.
- Bali, M., & Caines, A. (2018). A call for promoting ownership, equity, and agency in faculty development via connected learning. *TechTrends*, 62(3), 262–268. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-018-0128-8>
- Barron, B., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2008). *Teaching for meaningful learning: A Review of Research on Inquiry-Based and Cooperative Learning*. Jossey-Bass.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a>
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2002). *Critical academic writing and multilingual students*. University of Michigan Press.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47.
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2009). 'Multiliteracies': New literacies, new learning. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 4(3), 164–195. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15544800903076044>
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2015). *A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Learning by design*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2023). Towards education justice: The Multiliteracies Project Revisited. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003349662-1>
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Dewi, D. S., Hartono, R., Saleh, M., & Wahyuni, S. (2025). Fostering learner autonomy in EFL setting through multiliteracy pedagogy: A case in tertiary education. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 50(2), 1–18. <https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol50/iss2/1/>
- Dudeney, G., Hockly, N., & Pegrum, M. (2013). *Digital literacies: Research and resources in language teaching*. Pearson.
- Elmborg, J. (2006). Critical information literacy: Implications for instructional practice. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 32(2), 192–199. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2005.12.004>
- Flowerdew, J., & Peacock, M. (2001). Issues in EAP: A preliminary perspective. In J. Flowerdew & M. Peacock (Eds.), *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes* (pp. 8–24). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524766.004>
- Freebody, P., & Luke, A. (1990). 'Literacies' programs: Debates and demands in cultural context. *Prospect: An Australian Journal of TESOL*, 5(3), 7–16.
- Green, C. and Giblin, I. (2025). An empty systematic review of the 'pedagogy of multiliteracies' in K-12 since 1996: A generation later, evidence it improves literacy outcomes is lacking from (quasi-)experimental classroom interventions. *Review of Education*, 13, e70118. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.70118>
- Hull, G. A., & Nelson, M. E. (2005). Locating the semiotic power of multimodality. *Written Communication*, 22(2), 224–261. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088304274170>
- Hyland, K. (2002). Specificity revisited: How far should we go now? *English for Specific Purposes*, 21(4), 385–395. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(01\)00028-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(01)00028-X)
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667251>

- Hyland, K. (2007). Genre pedagogy: Language, literacy and L2 writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(3), 148–164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.07.005>
- Jewitt, C. (2008). Multimodality and literacy in school classrooms. *Review of Research in Education*, 32(1), 241–267. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X07310586>
- Jiang, L., & Hafner, C. (2024). Digital multimodal composing in L2 classrooms: A research agenda. *Language Teaching*, 58(4), 1–19.
- Klingner, J. K., & Vaughn, S. (1998). Using collaborative strategic reading. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 30(6), 32–37. <https://doi.org/10.1177/004005999803000607>
- Kukulska-Hulme, A., Bossu, C., Coughlan, T., Ferguson, R., FitzGerald, E., Gaved, M., Herodotou, C., Rienties, B., Sargent, J., Scanlon, E., Tang, J., Wang, Q., Whitelock, D., Zhang, S. (2021). *Innovating Pedagogy 2021: Open University Innovation Report 9*. Milton Keynes: The Open University.
- Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2011). *New literacies: Everyday practices and social learning* (3rd ed.). Open University Press.
- Lim, F. V., Toh, W., & Nguyen, T. T. H. (2022). Multimodality in the English language classroom: A systematic review of literature. *Linguistics and Education*, 69, 101048. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2022.101048>
- Loerts, T., & Belcher, C. (2024). Pedagogy in the context of multiliteracies: A longitudinal study of new educators. *The Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, 47(1), 107–124. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44020-023-00052-4>
- Mayer, R. E. (2009). *Multimedia learning* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511811678>
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- New London Group. (1996). *A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures*. Harvard Educational Review, 66(1), 60–92. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.66.1.17370n67v22j160u>
- Nystrand, M. (2006). Research on the role of classroom discourse as it affects reading comprehension. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 40(4), 392–412.
- Paesani, K., & Allen, H. W. (2020). Teacher development and multiliteracies pedagogy: Challenges and opportunities for postsecondary language programs. *Second Language Research & Practice*, 1(1), 124–138. <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/69844>
- Pearson, P. D., & Gallagher, M. C. (1983). The instruction of reading comprehension. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 8(3), 317–344. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0361-476X\(83\)90019-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0361-476X(83)90019-X)
- Pressley, M., & Afflerbach, P. (1995). *Verbal protocols of reading: The nature of constructively responsive reading*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Priego, S., & Carcamo, B. (2025). Developing EFL students' multimodal literacy with the use of infographics. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 10, Article 44. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-025-00322-3>
- Richardson, I. (2024). A phenomenological study of EFL teachers' experiences in putting multiliteracy pedagogy through online teaching. *Indonesian Journal of English Education*, 11(1), 45–62. <https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v11i1.34196>
- Spires, H. A., & Donley, J. (1998). Prior knowledge activation: Inducing engagement with informational texts. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90(2), 249–260. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.90.2.249>
- Stahl, K. A. D. (2004). Proof, practice, and promise: Comprehension strategy instruction in the primary grades. *The Reading Teacher*, 57(7), 598–609.

- Veliz, L., Farias, M., & Picard, M. (Eds.). (2024). Reimagining literacies pedagogy in the twenty-first century: Theorizing and enacting multiple literacies for English language learners. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Veliz, L., & Nguyen, M. H. (2025). Multiliteracies pedagogy: Teachers' interactive and reflexive positionings in EAL classrooms. *The Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44020-025-00090-0>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Wang, Z., Chen, X., & Li, Y. (2025). Place-based digital composing practices in multimodal pedagogy: A design-based approach to enhancing bilingual educators' professional development. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 28(3), 424–449. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2025.2588674>
- Wineburg, S., & McGrew, S. (2017). Lateral reading: Reading less and learning more when evaluating digital information.