Multiliteracy in Language Subjects. A systematic literature review from 1996 to 2020

Gabriela Báez-Bargellini iD
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Chile
gfbaez@uc.cl

Alejandra Meneses-Arévalo iD
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Chile
amenesea@uc.cl

Abstract

As a result of digital, social, and cultural transformations, literacy practices today incorporate different semiotic modes, media, and spaces both inside and outside the school. However, language teaching in schools has mainly focused on learning decoding skills and verbal literacy. Although a multiliteracy pedagogy was proposed over a decade ago, limited research has been conducted about the benefits and challenges of implementing it in primary and secondary education. Therefore, this article presents a systematic review of research findings on multiliteracy practices in school contexts within the Language subject in the period 1996-2020. Through two database searches and a subsequent inductive analysis, 26 empirical studies were selected. Three themes to understand how multiliteracy has been addressed emerged from the article analysis: multimodal genres, pedagogy of multiliteracy and diversity recognition. The results highlight how pedagogical practices enable the incorporation of semiotic modes beyond the verbal to foster communication and drive changes toward more democratic, dialogical, and inclusive classroom dynamics.

Keywords: Multiliteracies; literacy; multimodality; linguistic diversity.

Multiliteracidad en la asignatura de Lenguaje. Revisión sistemática de la literatura entre 1996 y 2020

Gabriela Báez-Bargellini iD
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Chile
gfbaez@uc.cl

Alejandra Meneses-Arévalo iD
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Chile
amenesea@uc.cl

Resumen

Producto de las transformaciones digitales, sociales y culturales, las prácticas de literacidad en la actualidad incorporan diversos modos semióticos, medios y espacios tanto dentro como fuera de la escuela. Sin embargo, la enseñanza del lenguaje en las escuelas se ha centrado principalmente en el aprendizaje del código y en la literacidad verbal. A pesar de que se ha propuesto una pedagogía de la multiliteracidad hace más de una década, se ha explorado poco sobre los beneficios y dificultades de su implementación en la educación primaria y secundaria. Por lo tanto, este artículo sistematiza las evidencias de investigaciones sobre prácticas de multiliteracidad en contextos escolares en la asignatura de Lenguaje en el periodo 1996-2020. A partir de dos búsquedas en base de datos y un análisis inductivo posterior, se seleccionaron 26 estudios empíricos. Del análisis de los artículos, emergieron tres temas para comprender cómo se ha abordado la multiliteracidad: géneros multimodales, pedagogía de la multiliteracidad y reconocimiento de la diversidad. Los resultados resaltan cómo las prácticas pedagógicas posibilitan la incorporación de otros modos semióticos, además del verbal, para fomentar la comunicación, así como cambios hacia dinámicas más democráticas, dialógicas e inclusivas en el aula.

Palabras clave: Multiliteracidad; literacidad; multimodalidad; diversidad lingüística.

Introduction

Social practices undergo constant transformations, partially due to the digital tools that have emerged and led to the construction of new labor and citizen logics (Abdullah et al., 2020; Beetham et al., 2009; Martínez-Bahena et al., 2019; OECD, 2018; Pérez, 2012). In this context of change and growing uncertainty, schools, in their role as socializing agents and promoters of culture, face the tension generated by the demand for an educational approach that integrates digital media to foster the development of meanings and relationships (Callow, 2006; Mills & Unsworth, 2017; Unsworth, 2002). Elementary and secondary school students actively participate in discourses outside of school that are composed of multiple languages through which they project identities using various digital media (Faulkner, 2003). This poses additional challenges for schools, not only in terms of pedagogical practices, but also because of the heterogeneity of knowledge that students have about digital literacy practices learned outside of school (Kalantzis et al., 2020).

On the other hand, the wide circulation of information through social networks requires the school to teach the development of critical thinking skills and interpretation of information in a way that transcends the verbal (Callow, 2006; Unsworth, 2014). In digital contexts, multimodal discourses require critical readers capable of drawing conclusions from a thorough analysis of the evidence presented (Silverblatt, 2018). Therefore, the promotion of critical thinking through these new modes and digital media encourages students to question the information that is received, created, and shared, a skill that is essential for a peaceful democracy, as students are taught to reason, construct meaning and make informed decisions (Gainer, 2012).

Educational systems have responded rather slowly to the adoption of these modes and means, which aim to foster more meaningful understandings among students (García-Martín et al., 2016; Gee, 2012; Gee & Hayes, 2011; Vandommele et al., 2017). Likewise, they have not yet sufficiently fostered the development of critical thinking in students through these new languages (Castellví, 2020; Gainer, 2012). The school continues to be a conservative space where the teaching of literacy is mainly focused on decoding the written word, as well as the understanding and production of written texts in an abstract and decontextualized way (González-García, 2018; Knobel & Lankshear, 2014; Monfort & Hurtado, 2013; O'Brien & Scharber, 2008). As a result, tension is observed between the teaching of literacy in school –restricted to the formal, monolingual, monocultural and print-focused– and the multiliteracy that circulates outside the school –open to the multimodal construction of meanings, multilingual, multicultural and digital (Coiro et al., 2008; Gee & Hayes, 2011; Yi et al., 2019). Although there seems to be a consensus regarding the need for literacy teaching practices to change, conventional literacies still predominate within the school, while the "new literacies" are created and recreated by students outside of formal educational settings (Gee, 2012; Kinzer & Leu, 2017). Added to this is the lack of knowledge regarding what type of digital reading and writing activities would facilitate the development of students' literacy (Burnett & Merchant, 2013) and how to develop critical thinking in this context (Beach, 2012; O'Halloran et al., 2017).

To contribute to knowledge about multiliteracy, a concept that encompasses both the integration of various modes and means of communication, as well as the importance of the growing linguistic and cultural diversity (Allison & Goldston, 2018; Cope & Kalantzis, 2000), this study presents a systematic literature review that examines empirical studies between 1996-2020 on classroom practices that have incorporated multiliteracy in the subject of Language. This article focuses specifically on this area of the school curriculum, since it is supposed to be more

prone to integrate new teaching elements related to different digital media and semiotic modes. However, both at the levels of the school curriculum and teacher training, this discipline has mainly focused on the description of grammar, the preservation of norms and the literary canon (Sotomayor et al., 2011; Vera & Palma, 2008).

This systematic literature review sought to answer two questions:

(1) What areas of multiliteracy have been considered in Language teaching in empirical articles published between 1996 and 2020?

(2) What lessons have been drawn from the incorporation of multiliteracy in Language teaching in the reviewed articles?

Towards a definition of multiliteracy

Various theorists have addressed the phenomenon of current literacies, as well as the new forms used to construct meanings in different social spaces through various means and semiotic modes to achieve various communicative purposes (Bawden, 2001; Coiro et al., 2008; Gee, 2012; Unsworth, 2002). However, the concept of multiliteracy has been specifically used to establish a pedagogical perspective that addresses these new ways of constructing meanings.

The term *multiliteracy* was coined by the *New London Group* in 1996 in response to the changes in the globalized world and the new ways and means of communication (Kalantzis & Cope, 2008; O'Rourke, 2005). This concept encompasses two fundamental aspects. On the one hand, it recognizes the interaction of multiple semiotic modes in the creation of meanings, and, on the other hand, it highlights the situated character of meanings that circulate in different contexts. In this sense, local differences are valued in a global context as a way of promoting the inclusion of cultural diversity (Kalantzis et al., 2020; Kalantzis & Cope, 2008; Mills, 2009).

Despite the numerous didactic proposals, it is still not understood why multiliteracy has not managed to permeate formal learning spaces. As Burnett and Merchant (2015) point out, despite declaring the importance of new literacies in education, curricular reforms and standardized assessments tend to favour command of the verbal language and comprehension of printed texts. Thus, there is a lack of consistency between what is declared relevant in curriculum frameworks and what is assessed on standardized tests (Stromquist, 2017). Although the pedagogy of multiliteracy has been proposed for more than two decades (Kalantzis & Cope, 2008), there are still not enough empirical studies on how this conceptual framework can be translated into an effective pedagogy for classroom teaching, especially in the area of Language (Mills, 2009).

Pedagogy of multiliteracy

Multiliteracy proposes a multisystemic pedagogy that involves the construction of meaning through situated practices, the integration of different semiotic modes, and a technology-focused approach (Guo et al., 2009; Kalantzis & Cope, 2008). How can you promote multiliteracy with a humanistic perspective in which students become informed questioners of digital tools? (Damasceno, 2021; Selber, 2004). In this sense, how can the approach be extended beyond the technical domain of technology and promote a perspective that incorporates critical thinking?

The pedagogy of multiliteracy proposes that knowledge and meanings are historically and socially situated and constructed (Kalantzis & Cope, 2008). In this conceptualization, three phases are proposed in the process of meaning construction: available design, design process, and redesign. Available design refers to the resources that already exist for the creation of

meaning in a particular context; the design process involves planning and creating new texts to construct meaning by recontextualizing available designs, experimentation, and thoughtful decision-making; and redesign is the result of the design considering the resources that have been produced and transformed (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000; Kalantzis & Cope, 2008).

As proposed by the *New London Group*, multiliteracy pedagogy is based on a complex integration of four factors: (1) situated practice involving immersive experiences and construction of meaning based on the students' lives by using simulations of public spaces and workplaces to create meaning in authentic contexts; (2) open teaching that fosters systematic, analytical, and conscious understanding of meaning-making processes, which promotes the use of explicit metalanguage in the design; (3) critical frameworks that promote student reflection to interpret the social and cultural context; and (4) transformation practices for the modification of existing meanings and the construction of new meanings (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000; Mills, 2009).

Teachers adopting this approach need to develop a pedagogy that combines traditional aspects of literacy with multiliteracy competencies, as students will require these to function in today's society (Unsworth, 2001). The implementation of a multiliteracy pedagogy requires changes in both teaching practices and educational systems. In order to explore this topic more profoundly, this systematic review analyses the empirical findings to characterize the pedagogical practices focused on multiliteracy and to organize the most frequently used approaches for further study. The objective is to understand how this pedagogy is empirically adopted to contribute to future pedagogical practices in language instruction, focusing on multiple literacies according to the demands of the 21st century.

Method

To carry out this systematic literature review, two consecutive searches were performed in the Web of Science (WOS) database. The following concepts were used in the first exploratory search: (TS= *multiliteracies*) OR (TS= *multiliteracy*) AND (TS= *educati** OR TS=*school**). A broad search was chosen starting from the year 1996, as that was the year the *New London Group* coined the term. In this initial phase, a total of 182 articles were obtained. For the selection of articles, the following inclusion criteria were established: (1) published empirical articles; (2) explicit incorporation of the words *multiliteracy* or *multiliteracies*; (3) studies in primary or secondary education; (4) investigations carried out in the classroom or within the school. Regarding the exclusion criteria, the following studies were discarded: (1) theoretical reviews; (2) studies in preschool, higher or adult education; (3) investigations performed outside of the school context; (4) studies focused on the use of technology; (5) studies related to standardized assessments; (6) studies of artistic and scientific subjects such as Music, Biology, Chemistry or Physics; (7) studies not accessible through the databases; (8) early access studies. A review of titles, abstracts and keywords was performed. As a result, 13 articles that met the established criteria were selected.

A second search was carried out in order to focus on language instruction. The same search criteria were maintained and the terms referring to Language as a subject (TS= language OR TS= language arts) were added. As a result, a total of 95 articles were found. In addition to the above criteria, the following inclusion criteria were added: (1) articles with clearly defined sections; (2) in Language subjects; (3) focused on students and/or teachers. Excluded were (1) research involving trainee teachers and teacher perceptions; (2) articles already included in the exploratory search. After applying these criteria, 13 new articles were selected from the 95 obtained.

In total, 26 publications written in English were examined. The articles were analysed inductively through a detailed reading, paying attention to the incorporation of multiliteracy in pedagogical practices. For this, categories of analysis related to different elements of multiliteracy in the various pedagogical experiences considered were established to identify the relationships between these elements and the findings reported in the studies. These categories emerged from the approaches or perspectives adopted by studies to address the concept of multiliteracy. Thus, the articles were classified considering the following categories: (1) multimodal genres; (2) pedagogy of multiliteracy; and (3) recognition of diversity.

Results

Of the 26 selected articles, 73% (19) were published in or after 2015 and were concentrated in English-speaking countries such as the United States (9), Australia (4) or Canada (3), and in multilingual countries such as Singapore (3).

Multimodal genres in language teaching

Most of the reviewed studies (69%) focused on the analysis of multimodal genres for teaching in the subject of Language. The multimodal genre is understood as a situated communication practice that integrates more than one semiotic mode (verbal, visual, gestural, among others) for the construction of meanings (Mills, 2009). Within this category, a distinction was made between studies focused on multimodal genres of production and interpretation.

Regarding *multimodal production* practices, 15 of the 26 articles reviewed (table 1) incorporated the use of different semiotic modes for the creation of meanings. The results pertaining to multimodal production mainly revealed changes in the environment and the interaction dynamics of classroom learning (Howell et al., 2017; Mills & Exley, 2014; Ntelioglou et al., 2014; Smith, 2016; Thibaut & Curwood, 2017; Toohey et al., 2015). Mills & Exley (2014) observed that the incorporation of multimodal digital practices generated an ideological conflict between a traditional class structure and the inclusion of multimodal modes of learning, which was reflected in a readjustment of roles, with a greater emphasis on horizontal collaboration and leadership changes. Similar findings were noted by Ntelioglou et al. (2014), who observed that by allowing student experimentation and decision-making in multimodal writing, changes in power dynamics and a greater capacity for agency on the part of the students were generated in contrast to traditional practices, where the teacher leads the pedagogical acts.

On the other hand, the findings of studies focused on the interpretation of multimodal genres offer evidence on the use of semiotic resources for the development of critical thinking and the response of students to their sociocultural context (Ajayi, 2011; Kesler et al., 2016; Reyes-Torres & Raga, 2020). Reyes-Torres & Raga (2020) concluded that picture books turn out to be effective artifacts to promote both cognitive and sociocultural literacy, although no further details were provided to support this claim. For his part, Ajayi (2011) highlighted that students interpret the videos based on their knowledge of the world and their understanding of reality, which means that the interpretations of multimodal genres depend on the culture and society in which they are immersed.

Pedagogy of multiliteracy

The articles classified in this category used the multiliteracy pedagogy framework for two purposes: as a guiding axis for the implementation of classroom practices (Burke & Hardware, 2015; Lee, 2018; Lee et al., 2016; Tan & Guo, 2014) and as a framework of analysis for the experiences developed (Seglem & Garcia, 2018).

In relation to studies that used the pedagogy framework as a guiding axis in classroom practices, Tan and Guo (2014) incorporated multiliteracy pedagogies into the Language curriculum with adolescent students. This research highlighted the importance of including students' vernacular literacy practices in the classroom and highlights the fundamental role of the teacher as a key agent for innovation and achieving sustainable change in the classroom. On the other hand, the case study carried out by Burke and Hardware (2015) showed how a teacher intentionally implemented different aspects of the multiliteracy pedagogy with her students of English as a second language. Through the creation of digital compositions, a transformative learning experience in which a reflective critique of the contents that made up the projects was conducted. In both articles, the researcher's voice reconstructed the study experience by creating narratives based on their observations.

The study by Lee et al. (2016) incorporated the pedagogy of multiliteracy as a guiding axis in classroom practices through a computer-assisted program for teaching English as a foreign language. Although the article focused mainly on describing the intervention in detail rather than the learning outcomes, the authors highlighted that by using a multiliteracy pedagogy, students were able to increase and deepen their understanding of culture beyond theoretical knowledge. On the other hand, the study by Lee (2018) focused on the analysis of the pedagogical challenges faced by Korean teachers and students in the subject of English as a foreign language. The results point to pedagogical, social, and cultural challenges, including the high costs of implementing intercultural experiences, as well as inequities in students' cultural capital and unequal formation of their linguistic identities.

Regarding the pedagogy of multiliteracy as a framework of analysis, the study by Seglem and Garcia (2018) examined the pedagogical implementation of an English didactic unit with eighth grade students. Although the learning outcomes were not described in the study, the analysis of the pedagogical experience highlighted benefits such as the authentic and situated use of digital tools, the promotion of autonomous learning, the transfer of decision-making to students and the development of critical analysis in various learning contexts.

In summary, several studies in this category (Burke & Hardware, 2015; Lee, 2018; Lee et al., 2016; Tan & Guo, 2014; Seglem & Garcia, 2018) adopted a testimonial approach in which researchers constructed findings from detailed descriptions of observed experiences (Goggin, 1994) and did not prioritize the analysis of learning outcomes using quantitative approaches.

Recognition of diversity

Another key aspect of the concept of multiliteracy that emerged from the analysis of the articles is the recognition and visibility of minorities. In this category, a multiliteracy approach that embraces local differences as a way of promoting the inclusion of cultural diversity prevails (Kalantzis & Cope, 2008; Mills, 2009). Thus, the articles included in this section are divided into cultural minorities and minorities from vulnerable contexts.

Articles related to *cultural minorities* focused mainly on migrant students (Danzak, 2011; Ntelioglou et al., 2014; Skerrett, 2012; Villalva, 2006) and intercultural populations (Krulatz et al.,

2018). Studies on migrant students often addressed issues of identity and language use in bilingual contexts. Danzak (2011) reported on the experience of a personal journal for migrant students to share their stories through comics. This project fostered the development of identity, promoted multiculturalism, and built spaces of trust among adolescents.

For their part, the case studies with migrant minorities delved into the development of communication skills for social adaptation in different contexts. Skerrett (2012) investigated the changes in the language and literacy practices of an adolescent during her transnational experience between two countries. The findings revealed that the student experienced changes in her multiliteracy practices and in the use of interconnected languages, which facilitated her understanding and allowed her to function in a transnational life. Villalva (2006) observed two bilingual migrant Mexican students to learn about their research skills and how these impacted their writing process in the English subject. The results revealed that the linguistic minorities possessed research skills and wrote using academic English, with uses that differed from monolingual students. However, these abilities tended to be imperceptible to their teachers, revealing the existence of hidden literacy.

Another study focused on intercultural contexts, with a focus on cultural minorities, investigated the behaviour of teachers in an intervention that promoted multiliteracy and intercultural citizenship. The results showed that the understanding of the native language and multiliteracy did not receive the required support from teachers to promote literacy development and academic success. However, the project succeeded in strengthening awareness of cultural and linguistic diversity in schools (Krulatz et al., 2018).

On the other hand, other multiliteracy studies focused on minorities from academically vulnerable contexts, such as students with low academic performance (Anderson et al., 2017; Kohnen & Lacy, 2018) or from low income backgrounds (Zammit, 2011). Anderson et al. (2017) emphasized the significance of recognizing the creative potential in the multimodal design of persuasive texts for high school students. The results highlight the positions of the authors and the rhetorical force of their multimodal creations, which suggests that the adoption of multimodal tasks could generate a drastic change in classroom dynamics and the students' knowledge, identity, and actions, compared to more traditional forms of the text. On the other hand, the study carried out by Kohnen and Lacy (2018) showed that when evaluating different news sources, students questioned the media's narrative and the evidence presented, and finally built their own narrative from knowledge of the news event. These studies adopted a multiliteracy pedagogy and observed classroom dynamics that differed from traditional ones, as academically marginalized students were able to engage in learning, develop their voice, and assume a more active role.

Regarding the studies with low-income students that incorporated multiliteracy practices, Zammit (2011) analysed the construction of students' knowledge through multimodal texts and the integration of information and communication technologies (ICT) with authentic purposes. The results highlight a greater participation and involvement of students in the learning process, as well as the development of new literacy practices. In addition, the students recognized the school as a space of significant belonging.

In summary, the findings indicate that the integration of multiliteracy in pedagogical practices aimed at socially or culturally marginalized groups, or those in a vulnerable situation, favours greater student commitment to the learning process.

Table 1.   Summary of articles by category of analysis

Categories	Subcategories	
Multimodal generes	**Production**Anderson et al., 2017Cordero et al., 2018Danzak, 2011Gregori-Signes, 2014Howell et al., 2017Lee et al., 2016Mills & Exley, 2014Ntelioglou et al., 2014Smith, 2016Sofkova-Hashemi, 2017Thibaut & Curwood, 2017Toohey et al., 2015Towndrow et al., 2013Yelland, 2018Zammit, 2011	**Interpretation**Ajayi, 2011Kesler et al., 2016Reyes-Torres & Raga, 2020
Pedagogy of multiliteracy	**Guiding axis**Burke & Hardware, 2015Lee, 2018Lee et al., 2016 Tan & Guo, 2014	**Analysis of the experience**Seglem & Garcia, 2018
Diversity recognition	**Cultural minorities** *Migrant students* Danzak, 2011Ntelioglou et al., 2014Skerrett, 2012Villalva, 2006 *Intercultural populations* Krulatz et al., 2018	**Minorities from vulnerable contexts** *Academically* Anderson et al., 2017Kohnen & Lacy, 2018 *Low-income* Zammit, 2011

Discussion and conclusions

This systematic literature review sought to contribute to the construction of a comprehensive vision regarding classroom experiences that have incorporated multiliteracy in Language subjects in primary and secondary education. Most of the studies on multiliteracy in Language subjects carried out between 1996-2020 were concentrated in the second part of the 2010s (16 articles) and were carried out in countries where English is the official language (19 articles). This could indicate that the study of multiliteracy is a relatively new area of interest, particularly in English-speaking countries.

After analysing the 26 articles, three thematic areas were identified: multimodal genres, pedagogy of multiliteracy and diversity recognition. These areas represent the perspectives from which the articles approached the concept of multiliteracy in their research. The lessons extracted from the articles regarding the incorporation of multiliteracy in Language teaching include changes in the classroom environment and dynamics (Howell et al., 2017; Mills & Exley, 2014; Ntelioglou et al., 2014; Smith, 2016; Thibaut & Curwood, 2017; Toohey et al., 2015), a greater understanding of other cultures and the conceptualization of writing focused on collaborative and multimodal practices (Lee et al., 2016), as well as the promotion of identity and multiculturalism (Danzak, 2011).

Based on the characteristics of the 26 articles included, it can be seen that the inclusion of multiliteracy in the classroom generates positive changes in classroom dynamics and student roles (Howell et al., 2017; Mills & Exley, 2014; Ntelioglou et al., 2014; Smith, 2016; Thibaut & Curwood, 2017; Toohey et al., 2015), which translates into more participatory classrooms, changes in leadership and increased horizontal collaboration among the participants. This influences the disposition of students towards learning, which is manifested in attitudes of greater commitment and agency. Therefore, it can be empirically concluded that a teaching approach based on multiliteracy differs from traditional education, where students have little room for decision-making in aspects such as study methods, topics to be addressed and classroom dynamics during literacy tasks. In this way, pedagogical practices that include multimodal production and interpretation could allow development in two areas: on the one hand, in the initiation and adoption of other semiotic modes to communicate and, on the other hand, changes toward a more democratic and dialogic classroom environment.

Despite the aforementioned strengths, the implementation of a multiliteracy pedagogy also presents challenges related to the availability of resources and the paradigm shift by teachers towards a more dialogic education that focuses on the needs and interests of students and meets the demands of the 21st century. Although only the study by Lee (2018) mentions the high costs of implementing intercultural experiences in the classroom, it is evident that the inclusion of new educational perspectives will require the use of technological tools that facilitate the teaching and learning processes.

The most relevant challenge is likely the paradigm shift for Language teachers. A multiliteracy pedagogy implies a broad vision of communication, which translates into multimodal practices, as well as the recognition of inclusive and diverse literacies (Kalantzis & Cope, 2008; Mills, 2009). As reported by Tan and Guo (2014), the incorporation of multiliteracy practices in the classroom requires teachers be willing to adopt lasting changes in their practices, as well as to appropriate the theory to exercise a practice consistent with this perspective (Krulatz et al., 2018). Therefore, putting these themes into practice and appropriating them implies a higher level of teaching competence, although the concept of multiliteracy encompasses areas such as minorities and their different linguistic identities, multimodal communication, and cultural and linguistic diversities in intercultural spaces.

Among the articles analyzed, qualitative approaches with detailed descriptions of the experiences predominate (Reyes-Torres & Raga; 2020; Krulatz et al., 2018; Burke & Hardware, 2015; Lee, 2018; Lee et al., 2016; Seglem & Garcia, 2018; Tan & Guo, 2014). Indeed, experiences prevail in classroom interventions, where the voice of the authors narrates the events, which Goggin (1994) refers to as "testimonial articles." Therefore, future research could expand and diversify the production and analysis methodologies used, incorporating quantitative and mixed designs to understand the relationship between experiences and learning outcomes. The results obtained from the systematic literature review highlight how multiliteracy pedagogical practices facilitate the inclusion of other semiotic modes, beyond verbal language, to promote communication in authentic and local contexts, and generate transformations towards more democratic, dialogical, and inclusive classroom dynamics.

Funding

References

Abdullah, A. G., Adriany, V., & Abdullah, C. U. (2020). *Borderless education as a challenge in the 5.0 society: Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Educational Sciences (ICES 2019), November 7, 2019, Bandung, Indonesia.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003107279

Ajayi, L. (2011). A multiliteracies pedagogy: Exploring semiotic possibilities of a Disney video in a third grade diverse classroom. *Urban Review, 43*(3), 396-413. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-010-0151-0

Allison, E., & Goldston, M. J. (2018). Modern scientific literacy: A case study of multiliteracies and scientific practices in a fifth grade classroom. *Journal of Science Education and Technology, 27*(3), 270–283. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-017-9723-z

Anderson, K. T., Stewart, O. G., & Kachorsky, D. (2017). Seeing academically marginalized students' multimodal designs from a position of strength. *Written Communication, 34*(2), 104–134. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088317699897

Bawden, D. (2001). *Information and digital literacies: A review of concepts.* 218-259. https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000007083

Beach, R. (2012). Uses of digital tools and literacies in the English language arts classroom. *Research in the Schools, 19*(1).

Beetham, H., McGill, L., & Littlejohn, A. (2009). *Thriving in the 21st century: Report of the learning literacies in a digital age project.* JISC.

Burke, A., & Hardware, S. (2015). Honouring ESL students' lived experiences in school learning with multiliteracies pedagogy. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 28*(2), 143–157. https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2015.1027214

Burnett, C., & Merchant, G. (2013). *Learning, literacies and new technologies: the current context and future possibilities* (2nd edition). Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446247518.n32

Burnett, C., & Merchant, G. (2015). The challenge of 21st-century literacies. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 59*(3), 271–274. https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.482

Callow, J. (2006). Images, politics and multiliteracies: Using a visual metalanguage. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy, 29*(1), 7–23.

Castellví, J. (2020). *Leer, interpretar y actuar en un mundo digital: Literacidad crítica digital en educación primaria, 19*, 17–27. https://doi.org/10.1344/ECCSS2020.19.3

Coiro, J., Knobel, M., Lankshear, C., & Leu, D. J. (Ed.). (2008). *Handbook of research on new literacies.* Routledge.

Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2000). *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and design of social futures* (B. Cope & M. Kalantzis (eds.)). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203979402

Cordero, K., Nussbaum, M., Ibaseta, V., Oteíza, M. J., & Chiuminatto, P. (2018). Read, write, touch: Co-construction and multiliteracies in a third-grade digital writing exercise. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 34*(2), 162–173. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12224

Damasceno, C. S. (2021). Multiliteracies for combating information disorder and fostering civic dialogue. In *Social Media and Society, 7*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305120984444

Danzak, R. L. (2011). Defining identities through multiliteracies: El teens narrate their immigration experiences as graphic stories. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 55*(3), 187–196. https://doi.org/10.1002/JAAL.00024

Faulkner, J. (2003). Book Review: Teaching multiliteracies across the curriculum: changing contexts text and image in classroom practice. *Australian Journal of Education, 47*(3), 303–304. https://doi.org/10.1177/000494410304700308

Gainer, J. (2012). Critical thinking: Foundational for digital literacies and democracy. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 56*(1), 14–17. https://doi.org/10.1002/JAAL.00096

García-Martín, J., Merchant, G., & García-Sánchez, J.-N. (2016). Preparing to teach 21st century literacies. *Building Bridges*, 43–55. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6300-491-6_4

Gee, J. P. (2012). The old and the new in the new digital literacies. *Educational Forum, 76*(4), 418–420. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2012.708622

Gee, J. P., & Hayes, E. R. (2011). *Language and learning in the digital age.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203830918

Goggin, M. D. (1994). *The shaping of a discipline: An historical study of the authorizing role of professional journals in rhetoric and composition, 1950-1990.* Carnegie Mellon University.

González García, J. (2018). El enfoque multimodal del proceso de alfabetización. En *Educação em Revista, 34*, 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1590/0102-4698177266

Gregori-Signes, C. (2014). Digital storytelling and multimodal literacy in education. *Porta Linguarum, 22*, 237–250. https://doi.org/10.30827/digibug.53745

Guo, L., Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2009). Multiliteracies: Introduction to the Special Issue. *Pedagogies: An International Journal, 4*(3), 159–163. https://doi.org/10.1080/15544800903075939

Howell, E., Butler, T., & Reinking, D. (2017). Integrating multimodal arguments into high school writing instruction. *Journal of Literacy Research, 49*(2), 181–209. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X17700456

Kalantzis, M., & Cope, B. (2008). Language education and multiliteracies. *Encyclopedia of Language and Education, 1*, 195–211. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3_15

Kalantzis, M., Cope, B., & Zapata, G. C. (2020). *Las alfabetizaciones múltiples: Teoría y práctica.* Ediciones Octaedro.

Kesler, T., Tinio, P. P., & Nolan, B. T. (2016). What's our position? A critical media literacy study of popular culture websites with eighth-grade special education students. *Reading and Writing Quarterly, 32*(1), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2013.857976

Kinzer, C. K., & Leu, D. J. (2017). New literacies, New Literacies. *Encyclopedia of Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 1559–1565. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-588-4_111

Knobel, M., & Lankshear, C. (2014). Studying new literacies. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 58*(2), 97–101. https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.314

Kohnen, A. M., & Lacy, A. (2018). "They don't see us otherwise": A discourse analysis of marginalized students critiquing the local news. *Linguistics and Education, 46*, 102–112. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2018.07.002

Krulatz, A., Steen-Olsen, T., & Torgersen, E. (2018). Towards critical cultural and linguistic awareness in language classrooms in Norway: Fostering respect for diversity through identity texts. *Language Teaching Research, 22*(5), 552–569. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168817718572

Lee, K. (2018). Implementing computer-mediated intercultural communication in English education: A critical reflection on its pedagogical challenges. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 34*(6), 673–687. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12275

Lee, K, Ardeshiri, M., & Cummins, J. (2016). A computer-assisted multiliteracies programme as an alternative approach to EFL instruction. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education, 25*(5), 595–612. https://doi.org/10.1080/1475939X.2015.1118403

Martínez-Bahena, E., Campos-Perez, A., & Escamilla-Regis, D. (2019). *Industry 4.0 and the digital transformation... A new challenge for higher education. ECORFAN Journal-Republic of Paraguay, 5*(9), 13–19. https://doi.org/10.35429/EJROP.2019.9.5.13.19

Mills, K. A. (2009). *Multiliteracies: Interrogating competing discourses. Language and Education, 23*(2), 103–116. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780802152762

Mills, K. A., & Exley, B. (2014). Time, space, and text in the elementary school digital writing classroom. *Written Communication, 31*(4), 434–469. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088314542757

Mills, K. A., & Unsworth, L. (2017). Multimodal literacy. En G. Noblit (Ed.), *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*, 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.232

Monfort, S., & Hurtado, M. (2013, July 1-6). *Los códigos lingüísticos de las nuevas tecnologías* [Paper presentation]. En *X Jornadas de Sociología. Facultad de Ciencias Sociales, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina.*

Ntelioglou, B. Y., Fannin, J., Montanera, M., & Cummins, J. (2014). A multilingual and multimodal approach to literacy teaching and learning in urban education: A collaborative inquiry project in an inner city elementary school. *Frontiers in Psychology, 5*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00533

O'Brien, D., & Scharber, C. (2008). Digital literacies go to school: Potholes and possibilities. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 52*(1), 66–68. https://doi.org/10.1598/jaal.52.1.7

O'Halloran, K. L., Tan, S., & E, M. K. L. (2017). Multimodal analysis for critical thinking. *Learning, Media and Technology, 42*(2), 147–170. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2016.1101003

OECD. (2018). The future of education and skills: Education 2030. *OECD Education Working Papers*, 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-26068-2_3

Pérez, A. (2012). *Educarse en la era digital.* Ediciones Morata.

Reyes-Torres, A., & Raga, M. (2020). A Multimodal approach to foster the multiliteracies pedagogy in the teaching of EFL through picturebooks: The Snow Lion. *Atlantis. Journal of the Spanish Association for Anglo-American Studies, 42*(1), 94–119. https://doi.org/10.28914/Atlantis-2020-42.1.06

Seglem, R., & Garcia, A. (2018). Changing literacies and civic pathways: Multiliteracies in inquiry-driven classrooms. *Theory into Practice, 57*(1), 56–63. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2017.1390335

Selber, S. (2004). *Multiliteracies for a digital age.* SIU Press.

Silverblatt, A. (2018). Media literacy and critical thinking. *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy, 3*(2), 66–71. https://doi.org/10.13187/ijmil.2018.2.66

Skerrett, A. (2012). Languages and literacies in yranslocation: Experiences and perspectives of a transnational youth. *Journal of Literacy Research, 44*(4), 364–395. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296x12459511

Smith, B. E. (2016). Composing across modes: a comparative analysis of adolescents' multimodal composing processes. *Learning, Media and Technology, 42*(3), 259–278. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2016.1182924

Sofkova Hashemi, S. (2017). Socio-semiotic patterns in digital meaning-making: semiotic choice as indicator of communicative experience. *Language and Education, 31*(5), 432–448. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2017.1305396

Sotomayor, C., Parodi, G., Coloma, C., Ibáñez, R., & Cavada, P. (2011). La formación inicial de docentes de Educación General Básica en Chile ¿Qué se espera que aprendan los futuros profesores en el área de Lenguaje y Comunicación? *Pensamiento Educativo: Revista de Investigación Educacional Latinoamericana, 48*(1), 28–42. https://doi.org/10.7764/pel.48.1.2011.3

Stromquist, N. P. (2017). Las pruebas estandarizadas y la promesa del progreso académico Key words. *Revista de la Asociación de Sociología de la Educación (RASE), 10*2, 115–127. https://doi.org/10.7203/RASE.10.2.10058

Tan, L., & Guo, L. (2013). Multiliteracies in an outcome-driven curriculum: Where is its fit? *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 23*(1), 29–36. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-013-0082-0

Thibaut, P., & Curwood, J. S. (2017). Multiliteracies in practice: Integrating multimodal production across the curriculum. *Theory into Practice, 57*(1), 48–55. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2017.1392202

Toohey, K., Dagenais, D., Fodor, A., Hof, L., Nuñez, O., Singh, A., & Schulze, L. (2015). That sounds so cooool: Entanglements of children, digital tools, and literacy practices. *TESOL Quarterly, 49*(3), 461–485. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.236

Towndrow, P. A., Nelson, M. E., & Yusuf, W. F. B. M. (2013). Squaring literacy assessment with multimodal design: An analytic case for semiotic awareness. *Journal of Literacy Research, 45*(4), 327–355. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X13504155

Unsworth, L. (2001). *Teaching multiliteracies across the curriculum.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Unsworth, L. (2002). Changing dimensions of school literacies. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy, 6*(1), 62–77.

Unsworth, L. (2014). Multiliteracies and metalanguage: Describing image/text relations as a resource for negotiating multimodal texts. *Handbook of Research on New Literacies.* 377–406. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410618894

Vandommele, G., Van den Branden, K., Van Gorp, K., & De Maeyer, S. (2017). In-school and out-of-school multimodal writing as an L2 writing resource for beginner learners of Dutch. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 36*(1), 23–36. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2017.05.010

Vera, O. G., & Palma, O. A. V. (2008). Crisis y temporalidad en la formacion inicial de profesores de lenguaje y comunicacion. *Estudios Pedagogicos, 34*(2), 87–98. https://doi.org/10.4067/s0718-07052008000200005

Villalva, K. E. (2006). Hidden literacies and Inquiry Approaches of Bilingual High School Writers. *Written Communication, 23*(2), 91–129. https://doi.org/10.1177/07410883052839

Yelland, N. J. (2018). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Young children and multimodal learning with tablets. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 49*(5), 847–858. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12635

Yi, Y., Shin, D., & Cimasko, T. (2019). Multimodal literacies in teaching and learning English in and outside of school. *The Handbook of TESOL in K-12,* 163–177. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119421702.ch11

Zammit, K. P. (2011). Connecting multiliteracies and engagement of students from low socio-economic backgrounds: Using Bernstein's pedagogic discourse as a bridge. *Language and Education, 25*(3), 203–220. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2011.560945