



ENHANCING ENGLISH LITERACY THROUGH SITUATED PRACTICE OF MULTILITERACIES PEDAGOGY: A MIXED-METHOD STUDY AT SMPN NEONBAT

Mikhael Misa^{1*} Hesni Neno²

^{1,2}English Language Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Timor, East Nusa Tenggara (Kupang-NTT), Indonesia

Corresponding author's email: misamikhael@gmail.com

APA Citation: Misa, M., & Neno, H. (2026). Enhancing English literacy through situated practice of multiliteracies pedagogy: A mixed-method study at SMPN Neonbat. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 14(2), 835-844. <https://doi.org/10.25134/englishreview.v14i2.318>

Received: 11-04-2026

Accepted: 12-05-2026

Published: 24-07-2026

Abstract: This study investigates the Situated Practice of Multiliteracies Pedagogy in enhancing students' English literacy at SMPN Neonbat, a rural Indonesian school. The research employs a mixed-methods approach that integrates quantitative and qualitative data, as outlined in the multiliteracies framework, which emphasizes learning through multiple modalities and socio-cultural contexts. Pre- and post-test assessments were administered to collect quantitative data on reading comprehension and grammar. Conversely, qualitative data were collected through student interviews and classroom observations to investigate perceptions and engagement. The results indicate that students' performance has significantly improved in all areas. There was a substantial increase in reading comprehension scores, with gains of 95% in objective questions, 85% in fill-in-the-blank, and 74% in matching exercises. The improvement in grammar scores was even more significant, with a total of 133%, 121%, and 108%, respectively. The significance of these gains was verified through statistical analysis utilizing paired-sample t-tests. Qualitative research demonstrated that students were more engaged, confident, and actively involved in the learning process, particularly when courses were aligned with their cultural and social backgrounds. In general, the research indicates that the Situated Practice of Multiliteracies Pedagogy is effective in improving English literacy. It is particularly well-suited for rural educational environments due to its emphasis on contextualized, collaborative, and meaningful learning.

Key Terms: mixed-method, multiliteracy pedagogy, situated practice, English literacy

INTRODUCTION

The construction, representation, and communication of meaning have been fundamentally transformed by the rapid advancement of communication technologies in the twenty-first century. Traditional literacy, which is primarily focused on print-based literature, is no longer sufficient to meet the complex demands of modern communication in this evolving environment. The emergence of multiliteracies, as introduced by Loerts, T., & Belcher, C. (2024), underscores the need to engage with a variety of modes of meaning-making, such as linguistic, visual, audio, gestural, and spatial dimensions. This paradigm shift reflects the increasing significance of cultural and

contextual relevance in literacy practices and the diversification of communication channels (Gumartifa et al., 2025).

English literacy instruction in rural Indonesian institutions, such as SMPN Neonbat, is typically organized around traditional methods that emphasize decontextualized reading and grammar drills. This frequently impedes students' capacity to communicate effectively in English, leading to passive knowledge rather than real-world competence. To resolve this issue, multiliteracies pedagogy provides a more dynamic framework that prioritizes students' cultural heritage and lived experiences, thereby fostering the skills necessary for authentic communication (Arjulayana et al., 2025).

Situated Practice is a critical component of multiliteracies pedagogy. It underscores the importance of learning through engagement in activities that are both authentic and meaningful. This approach enables learners to apply their prior knowledge while working together on context-rich assignments. Within a social and cultural context, students become active participants in constructing meaning. Research indicates that these methodologies can enhance literacy development, motivation, and engagement by rendering the learning process more pertinent (Lim, 2025).

Although there is an increasing body of research on multiliteracies, few studies investigate the extent to which Situated Practice enhances English literacy in rural Indonesia. It is essential to investigate this topic because rural students face distinct challenges. These consist of insufficient resources and limited exposure to authentic language use. This study examines the following: (1) the impact of Situated Practice on students' English literacy; (2) the enhancement of reading comprehension and grammar through multiliteracies pedagogy; and (3) the perspective of students on multimodal and real-world tasks in the classroom.

By directly examining the impact of Situated Practice within Multiliteracies Pedagogy on English literacy in a rural junior high school, this study addresses a critical research gap. It underscores the study's importance in advancing both theory and classroom practice in ELT research by emphasizing the distinctive integration of multiliteracies theory and local practices at SMPN Neonbat. This study specifically examines Situated Practice as the fundamental instructional strategy in Multiliteracies Pedagogy, rather than emphasizing artificial intelligence-assisted learning or digital multimodal composition. It offers empirical evidence from a rural Indonesian junior high school, an educational context that has received scant attention in prior research on multiliteracies. The research employs a mixed-methods approach that combines qualitative inquiry into students' learning experiences with quantitative measures of English literacy development. The results indicate that meaningful English literacy development can be achieved through culturally responsive and authentic classroom practices, without primary reliance on sophisticated digital technologies.

The collective results of the preceding research indicate that Multiliteracies Pedagogy and

Situated Practice are effective strategies for fostering meaningful language acquisition in a variety of educational settings. Veliz and Nguyen (2026) investigated the implementation of multiliteracies pedagogy in English as an Additional Language (EAL) classrooms, with an emphasis on teachers' interactive and reflexive positioning during instruction. Their findings underscored the significance of teachers' professional identity and pedagogical decision-making in the effective implementation of multiliteracies. Saifulloh, Retnaningdyah, and Suhartono (2025) investigated the integration of technology, local culture, and authentic learning experiences to enhance student engagement in hybrid learning environments by implementing immersive Situated Practice within a local curriculum. To improve students' critical reading abilities through authentic classroom activities and meaningful literacy practices, Misa (2023) investigated the implementation of Situated Practice in an Indonesian junior secondary ELT classroom. In the same vein, Bruwer (2026) conducted a study on situated pedagogical Practice in rural schools, demonstrating that integrating local cultural contexts into literacy instruction effectively fosters students' critical biliteracy and cultural awareness.

These investigations possess numerous critical attributes. They all utilize qualitative research methods, including classroom observations, interviews, and documentation, to investigate teaching and learning processes, with Multiliteracies Pedagogy or Situated Practice serving as the primary instructional framework. Additionally, the results consistently suggest that multiliteracies-based instruction improves student engagement, critical thinking, collaboration, and meaningful learning by integrating literacy activities with learners' social, cultural, and real-world experiences. These results align with the principles of Karkar-Esperat (2025) that promote literacy education through socially situated and authentic practices.

The research focus, participants, educational objectives, and learning contexts of the studies vary, despite their similarities. Veliz and Nguyen (2026) focused on instructors' professional practices, while Saifulloh et al. (2025) examined technology-supported hybrid learning. In contrast, Misa (2023) focused on enhancing students' critical reading abilities in Indonesian junior secondary schools, while Bruwer (2026) prioritized critical biliteracy and cultural awareness among rural students. Additionally,

their research settings were diverse, encompassing Indonesian secondary schools, hybrid learning environments, EAL classrooms, and rural educational contexts.

In general, these prior investigations offer substantial evidence that Multiliteracies Pedagogy and Situated Practice have a beneficial impact on language acquisition. However, there is a scarcity of research that has investigated the comprehensive enhancement of English literacy through the integration of reading comprehension and grammar development in Indonesian junior secondary schools through the implementation of Situated Practice within the Multiliteracies Pedagogy framework. The current study, "Enhancing English Literacy through Situated Practice of Multiliteracies Pedagogy: A Mixed-Method Study," builds on previous research by examining how authentic, socially situated, and culturally responsive learning experiences can enhance students' overall English literacy. This gap serves as the foundation for the study. Therefore, the researcher examined the following research questions: (1) What is the extent to which the implementation of Situated Practice within Multiliteracies Pedagogy enhances the English literacy of students at SMPN Neonbat? (2) What is the impact of Situated Practice on the learning experiences, engagement, and participation of students during English language instruction?

In the twenty-first century, literacy encompasses the competencies necessary to access, evaluate, create, and communicate information across a variety of linguistic, digital, visual, and multimodal contexts, in addition to the traditional reading and writing skills. In a society that is becoming increasingly interconnected and technology-driven, contemporary literacy prioritizes effective participation, ethical decision-making, and critical thinking (Çelik et al., 2026; Slabko et al., 2026). The expansion of literacy education to encompass digital literacy, information literacy, media literacy, AI literacy, and multimodal literacy has been facilitated by the rapid advancement of digital technologies and artificial intelligence (AI). Garcia (2026) contends that digital multimodal composition reflects the changing nature of communication, while Slabko (2026) emphasizes the importance of AI literacy as a prerequisite for responsible interaction with generative AI technologies.

Modern literacy is significantly shaped by the Multiliteracies framework, which defines literacy as a socially situated process of meaning-making

that involves multiple semiotic modalities. Recent research underscores the necessity of literacy education to equip students to become critical designers of meaning who can seamlessly integrate human creativity with digital technologies while maintaining ethical awareness (Lim, 2026). Research also indicates that digital multimodal composing improves language learning, critical thinking, creativity, and collaboration by integrating technology with authentic communication (L. G. Jiang & Hafner, 2024; L. Jiang & Lai, 2025). Additionally, integrating AI into literacy education fosters responsible digital citizenship, reflective learning, and collaborative knowledge construction when accompanied by effective pedagogical practices (Hafner & Ho, 2026; Tang & Honeycutt, 2026). In general, contemporary literacy provides learners with the cognitive, digital, intercultural, and ethical competencies necessary to engage responsibly and communicate effectively in learning environments that are globally connected and supported by AI.

Multiliteracies Pedagogy is a modern educational framework that equips students to communicate and construct meaning across a variety of contexts, including visual, digital, multimodal, and linguistic ones. Multiliteracies, in contrast to conventional literacy approaches that prioritize reading and writing, emphasize learners' capacity to critically evaluate, create, and interpret information using a variety of semiotic resources. Simos (2026) contends that literacy education should foster learners' development as active designers of meaning, enabling them to engage effectively in culturally diverse and digitally connected societies. The framework is structured around four interconnected pedagogical components—Situated Practice, Overt Instruction, Critical Framing, and Transformed Practice—that collectively enhance the application of creative knowledge, critical reflection, and authentic learning.

Recent research has demonstrated the efficacy of Multiliteracies Pedagogy in enhancing learner engagement, digital literacy, and English language acquisition. Students can enhance their communication and critical thinking skills by integrating language with visual and technological resources through digital multimodal composition (Jing & Mahfoodh, 2026). Moreover, the quality of writing, creativity, collaboration, and metacognitive awareness are all improved by AI-assisted multimodal composing when generative AI is employed as a learning scaffold rather than a

substitute for human thinking (L. Jiang & Lai, 2025). Recent research has also underscored the importance of ethical AI use, critical digital literacy, and culturally responsive teaching as essential components of multiliteracies instruction (Hafner & Ho, 2026; Lim & Tan-Chia, 2022). In general, Multiliteracies Pedagogy provides learners with the linguistic, digital, intercultural, and critical competencies necessary to effectively engage in learning environments that are becoming increasingly interconnected and technology-rich (Sinaga et al., 2026; Tang & Honeycutt, 2026).

Situated Practice is a critical element of Multiliteracies Pedagogy that fosters literacy development by providing authentic, contextualized, and culturally meaningful learning experiences. Situated Practice views students as active participants who construct understanding by integrating new knowledge with their prior experiences, cultural identities, and real-life communication practices, rather than as passive recipients of knowledge (Victor Lim et al., 2026). This learner-centered approach fosters authentic participation, collaboration, and reflection, thereby allowing students to cultivate linguistic, critical, and intercultural competencies in meaningful social contexts. Recent research has also indicated that Situated Practice is still highly relevant in multilingual and technology-enhanced learning environments, as it facilitates culturally responsive and inclusive literacy instruction (Accurso et al., 2023).

Authentic learning experiences are essential to Situated Practice because they enhance learners' motivation, engagement, and participation. Contextualized instruction that integrates students' daily experiences and local culture renders literacy education more meaningful and pertinent (Sinaga et al., 2026). Similarly, digital multimodal composing offers learners genuine opportunities to communicate, collaborate, and construct meaning by utilizing a variety of semiotic resources. This, in turn, enhances language proficiency, creativity, and critical thinking (L. G. Jiang & Hafner, 2024; L. Jiang & Lai, 2025). Recent research has also underscored the significance of guided participation, in which teachers facilitate collaborative interaction, model effective literacy practices, and scaffold learning, thereby gradually fostering learners' independence and confidence (Hafner & Ho, 2026).

Additionally, Situated Practice prioritizes learners' cultural and linguistic diversity by advocating for culturally responsive instruction

and the strategic integration of multilingual resources. Inclusionary learning environments that foster literacy development and learner engagement are fostered by educators who recognize students' cultural identities and adjust their instruction to local contexts (Bayraklı, 2026; Hsieh et al., 2026). When guided by suitable pedagogical principles, the integration of AI-supported multimodal learning enhances collaborative knowledge construction and critical digital literacy (Tang & Honeycutt, 2026). In general, Situated Practice establishes a robust pedagogical foundation for the development of English literacy by incorporating authentic participation, collaboration, cultural relevance, and reflective learning in modern multilingual and digitally mediated educational environments ((Accurso et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2024).

METHOD

To provide a comprehensive and nuanced understanding of the development of students' English literacy, this investigation employed a mixed-methods research design that combined quantitative and qualitative methods. A mixed-methods design is particularly well suited to educational research, as it enables the researcher to triangulate findings, thereby improving reliability and validity (Njeri Mugwe & Runo, 2026). The quantitative component was designed to quantify the extent to which students' reading comprehension and grammar mastery have improved through statistical analysis. Conversely, the qualitative component examined students' learning experiences and engagement during the implementation of the Situated Practice of Multiliteracies Pedagogy (Meniado, 2025). This design is consistent with current research trends that prioritize integrating contextual insights and numerical data to gain a more comprehensive understanding of complex classroom phenomena ((Haq & Yasin, 2025; Ramlo, 2025).

The study included 33 eighth-grade pupils from SMPN Neonbat, selected through purposive sampling to represent a typical rural classroom environment. Purposive sampling is suitable for researchers seeking to identify participants with specific attributes pertinent to the investigation (Mukungu & Lyaka, 2026). These students were selected for their relatively similar socio-cultural and educational backgrounds, which are crucial to evaluating the efficacy of Situated Practice of Multiliteracies Pedagogy in a rural ELT environment. Rural classroom contexts are often significant for pedagogical innovation, as they

present unique challenges, such as limited access to resources and exposure to English (Busch et al., 2022). The selected participants therefore offered valuable insights into contextualized literacy learning.

To ensure comprehensive data collection, this investigation employed multiple instruments, including pre- and post-tests, interviews, documentation, and observation diaries. The assessments were designed to evaluate students' comprehension of the Simple Present Tense and their reading proficiency, both essential components of English literacy (Jayanti et al., 2023). Interviews provided a deeper understanding of students' perceptions and experiences, while observation sheets documented students' engagement and classroom interactions. The instrument's validity was verified by expert judgment, ensuring the clarity and relevance of the content. The coefficient of 0.82 obtained from Cronbach's Alpha reliability testing suggests that the instrument has a high level of internal consistency (Dorsah, 2026). The credibility and veracity of the findings are also improved by the use of multiple instruments, which facilitates data triangulation (Ikegami & Monteiro, 2026).

The data collection procedures spanned two months and comprised five systematic stages: preparation, implementation, data collection, data analysis, and conclusion drawing. Lesson plans and research instruments were developed and validated during the preparation phase. Situated Practice-based learning activities were implemented in the classroom during the implementation phase (Njeri Mugwe & Runo, 2026; Wang et al., 2025). Participants were interviewed, observations were conducted, and assessments were administered. To ensure methodological consistency and rigor throughout the investigation, the sequence was structured. Maintaining validity and reliability in classroom-based research requires such procedural organization (Friedman, 2025). Additionally, the iterative nature of the process facilitated continuous reflection and refinement, both of which are essential in mixed-methods educational research.

Descriptive and inferential statistics, such as mean scores, percentage improvements, and paired-sample t-tests, were employed to analyze quantitative data and ascertain the significance of

students' learning gains. The paired-sample t-test is particularly suitable for comparing pre-test and post-test results within the same group (Foote, 2025). In the interim, qualitative data were reduced, categorized, and interpreted to identify emergent themes and patterns in students' learning experiences. This analytical approach adheres to the framework proposed by Chand (2025) and Tazkia & Andriani (2026), which emphasizes systematic categorization and interpretation. The profundity and validity of the findings are enhanced by integrating quantitative and qualitative analyses, enabling a more comprehensive understanding of the influence of Situated Practice of Multiliteracies Pedagogy.

Situated Practice was operationalized through five essential components: integrating students' cultural contexts into instruction, providing models or examples, engaging students in authentic tasks, promoting collaborative learning, and activating prior knowledge. The principles of multiliteracies pedagogy, which emphasize learning as a socially situated and meaning-making process, are reflected in these components (Álvarez-Valencia & Castro-Garcés, 2025; Lim, 2025). Authentic tasks improve relevance and engagement, while activating prior knowledge facilitates the integration of new information with students' existing experiences. Cultural integration guarantees contextualized learning, while collaborative learning encourages social interaction and knowledge construction. This operationalization is consistent with current ELT practices, which prioritize learner-centered, context-based instruction to enhance literacy outcomes across a variety of educational environments (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2023).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Situated Practice of Multiliteracies Pedagogy has been shown to significantly enhance students' English literacy, as evidenced by this study's findings. The intervention's efficacy was demonstrated by a substantial increase in pupils' mean scores from pre-test to post-test, as revealed by quantitative analysis. This improvement was statistically significant, as confirmed by the paired-sample t-test, indicating that the observed changes were not due to chance. This can be shown in the table below.

Table 1. *Students' pre-test and post-test scores of reading and grammar*

Test Type	Component	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Gain	Improvement (%)
Reading	Objective	21	41	+20	95%
	Filling the Blank	20	37	+17	85%
	Matching	19	33	+14	74%
Grammar	Objective	15	35	+20	133%
	Filling the Blank	14	31	+17	121%
	Matching	13	27	+14	108%

The results of this study suggest that integrating Situated Practice into the Multiliteracies Pedagogy framework significantly enhanced students' English literacy, particularly in reading comprehension and grammar. The quantitative results indicate that the instructional intervention significantly improved students' literacy performance, as evidenced by consistent gains across all assessment components from the pre-test to the post-test.

In all reading comprehension assessments, students demonstrated substantial improvements, as illustrated in Table 1. The objective reading items exhibited the greatest development, with an average score that rose from 21 to 41, a gain of 20 points (95%). The fill-in-the-blank component increased from 20 to 37 (+17; 85%), while the matching component improved from 19 to 33 (+14; 74%). These results suggest that students initially enhanced their ability to identify explicit information before showing improvements in tasks requiring contextual interpretation and vocabulary recognition.

A comparable pattern was observed in the area of grammar proficiency. The highest percentage gain among all components was achieved by students in objective grammar items, which increased from 15 to 35 (+20; 133%). Matching exercises increased from 13 to 27 (+14; 108%), while the filling-in-the-blank section improved from 14 to 31 (+17; 121%). The higher percentage of grammar improvements indicates that students had relatively limited grammatical knowledge at the outset but responded favorably to contextualized and meaningful language learning activities.

In general, the quantitative results verify that students made significant progress in both reading comprehension and grammar as a result of implementing Situated Practice. The paired-sample t-test further demonstrated that the differences between pre-test and post-test scores were statistically significant ($p < .05$), suggesting that the observed improvements were attributable to the instructional intervention rather than random variation.

Qualitative findings from semi-structured interviews and classroom observations further substantiate the quantitative results. Students became more engaged in classroom activities during the intervention. They were more likely to express their ideas in English, asked questions more frequently, collaborated effectively with peers, and engaged more confidently in group discussions. Additionally, students demonstrated greater ability to connect English texts to their personal cultural experiences and daily lives, thereby enhancing the relevance and significance of classroom instruction.

Observation data also indicated that collaborative learning activities facilitated peer interaction and knowledge sharing, while culturally contextualized learning materials boosted students' motivation and engagement. Interviews revealed that students found learning English less intimidating because classroom activities were linked to familiar local contexts. This enabled them to comprehend texts and communicate with greater confidence.

The quantitative and qualitative results, taken together, indicate that Situated Practice effectively promoted students' English literacy by incorporating authentic learning experiences, collaborative interaction, and culturally responsive instruction.

Discussion

The study's findings indicate that integrating Situated Practice into the Multiliteracies Pedagogy framework significantly enhances students' English literacy, particularly in reading comprehension and grammar. Quantitative results demonstrated substantial improvements in students' literacy performance, while qualitative evidence indicated that these enhancements resulted from contextualized instruction, authentic learning experiences, collaborative interaction, and meaningful engagement. These results corroborate the notion that literacy is a social and cultural activity in which learners actively construct meaning through authentic participation, rather than

passive knowledge transmission (Kalantzis & Cope, 2025).

The first significant finding concerns the enhancement of reading comprehension. By engaging in authentic reading activities, reflective interpretation, and collaborative discussions relevant to their personal experiences, students acquired a deeper understanding of texts. Rather than relying solely on instructor explanations, such practices facilitated the collaborative analysis, interpretation, and negotiation of meaning among learners. These results are consistent with recent research indicating that multiliteracies-based instruction fosters critical reading, learner interaction, and meaning-making across a variety of communicative contexts (Cope & Kalantzis, 2005; Ivorgba, 2025; Johnstone, 2023).

The second discovery emphasizes the substantial enhancement in grammar proficiency. Rather than memorizing isolated grammatical rules, students acquired grammar through meaningful communication that was integrated into authentic reading and discussion activities. This contextualized approach enabled learners to recognize grammar as a communicative resource that facilitates language use in real-world scenarios. Similarly, recent research suggests that integrating grammar instruction into communicative literacy practices improves language accuracy, learner engagement, and long-term retention compared to traditional rule-based instruction (Ellis & Li, 2024; L. G. Jiang & Hafner, 2024).

Improved learner engagement and collaborative learning are another significant finding. The students' confidence in expressing their opinions, asking questions, participating in discussions, and solving problems collaboratively increased. Social interaction fostered the development of communicative competence, the exchange of perspectives, and the negotiation of meaning, all of which are indicative of the socio-cultural principles of language acquisition. These findings corroborate recent research that emphasizes the benefits of collaborative dialogue in multiliteracies classrooms, including enhanced learner agency, critical thinking, and active participation (K. (K. Liu & Diana Deris, 2023; Veliz & Nguyen, 2026).

The research also indicates that literacy learning is significantly enhanced by incorporating students' cultural backgrounds into classroom instruction. By making learning more meaningful and personally relevant, learning

materials connected to students' local experiences increased motivation, classroom participation, and reading comprehension. This discovery is consistent with culturally responsive instruction, which acknowledges learners' cultural identities as valuable resources for literacy development (Deacon et al., 2026; Miller et al., 2026). Similar findings have been reported by Saifulloh et al. (2025), who found that culturally situated learning significantly improves literacy engagement and motivation.

Another noteworthy finding is that Situated Practice does not require sophisticated digital technology to be successful. The research demonstrates that English literacy can be significantly enhanced in rural schools with limited technological resources through contextualized instruction, authentic communication, collaborative learning, and culturally meaningful experiences. This corroborates the assertion that the fundamental nature of Multiliteracies Pedagogy is rooted in diversified meaning-making practices and meaningful participation, rather than technological sophistication (Kalantzis & Cope, 2025; Lim, 2026).

Ultimately, the study substantiates the advantages of employing a mixed-methods research design. Quantitative analysis established statistically significant improvements in literacy outcomes, while qualitative findings elucidated the learning processes that underlie these gains. The credibility of educational intervention research is enhanced by integrating both forms of evidence, thereby providing a comprehensive understanding of instructional effectiveness (Gempes & Obenza, 2025; Ramlo, 2025).

In conclusion, the results suggest that Situated Practice is a highly effective element of Multiliteracies Pedagogy for enhancing English literacy. This pedagogical approach improves reading comprehension, grammar achievement, learner engagement, confidence, critical thinking, and learner autonomy by prioritizing contextualized communication, cultural relevance, authentic learning, and collaboration. These results bolster the current body of research that promotes multiliteracies as a sustainable, context-sensitive, and adaptable framework for English instruction across a variety of educational settings (D. Liu et al., 2025; Veliz & Nguyen, 2026).

CONCLUSION

The results of this study indicate that implementing Situated Practice of Multiliteracies

Pedagogy significantly improves students' English literacy, as demonstrated by both quantitative and qualitative findings. Integrating authentic tasks, cultural relevance, and collaborative learning establishes a more engaging and meaningful learning environment for students.

This study emphasizes the necessity of transitioning from conventional instructional methods to more contextualized and learner-centered practices in ELT from a pedagogical perspective. To promote deeper learning, educators are advised to integrate students' cultural backgrounds and real-life experiences into classroom activities.

Future research should investigate the long-term effects of this approach and its implementation in various educational environments. Furthermore, additional research may examine the role of digital multimodality in improving multiliteracies pedagogy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We would like to express our gratitude thanks to the Research and Community Service Institute (LP2M) of Timor University for providing funding for this research.

REFERENCES

- Accurso, K., Muzeta, B., & Battles, S. P. (2023). Reflection multiliteracies: Teaching meaning-making across the visual and language arts. In *In pursuit of a multilingual equity agenda* (pp. 89–108). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003162575-4>
- Álvarez-Valencia, J. A., & Castro-Garcés, Á. Y. (2025). From new literacies to multiliteracies: The language classroom as a multilingual, multicultural, and multimodal space. *Folios*, 62, 3–20. <https://doi.org/10.17227/folios.62-22226>
- Arjulayana, A., Pujiati, T., Hawanty, S., Prasetya, R. E., Alfisuma, M. Z., & Ilham, M. G. (2025). Enhancing university students speaking skills through multiliteracy and technology integration. *2025 4th International Conference on Creative Communication and Innovative Technology (ICCIT)*, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCIT65724.2025.11167201>
- Bayraklı, H. (2026). The experiences shaping culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy among pre-service special education teachers: Implications for teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 169, Article 105292. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2025.105292>
- Bruwer, B. J., & van Staden, A. (2026). Building foundations for biliteracy: Aligning curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment in early literacy. In *Policies and issues in deaf studies and education* (pp. 411–444). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3373-4317-4.ch015>
- Busch, I. M., Savazzi, S., Bertini, G., Cesari, P., Guaraldo, O., Nosè, M., Barbui, C., & Rimondini, M. (2022). A practical framework for academics to implement public engagement interventions and measure their impact. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(20), Article 13357. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph192013357>
- Çelik, S., Doğanlı, B., & Şaşmaz, E. (2026). Comparative analysis of global education performances based on PISA 2022 results: An assessment with statistical and machine learning methods. *Quality & Quantity*, 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-026-02915-7>
- Chand, S. P. (2025). Methods of data collection in qualitative research: Interviews, focus groups, observations, and document analysis. *Advances in Educational Research and Evaluation*, 6(1), 303–317. <https://doi.org/10.25082/AERE.2025.01.001>
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2023). Revisiting mixed methods research designs twenty years later. *Handbook of Mixed Methods Research Designs*, 1(1), 21–36. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781529682663.n6>
- Deacon, B., Gao, X., Wang, L., Hu, X., & Takai, J. (2026). Investigating Japanese university students' intercultural behavioral intent: A longitudinal study using the theory of planned behavior. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 110, Article 102323. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2025.102323>
- Dorsah, P. (2026). The use of Cronbach's alpha reliability in educational research: A systematic review. *European Journal of Contemporary Education and E-Learning*, 4(2), 39–50. [https://doi.org/10.59324/ejceel.2026.4\(2\).04](https://doi.org/10.59324/ejceel.2026.4(2).04)
- Ellis, R., & Li, S. (2024). Some thoughts on investigating individual differences in task-based language teaching. *Individual Differences and Task-Based Language Teaching*, 344–364. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tblt.16>
- Foote, L. A. (2025). Social work research and mixed methods: Stronger with a quality framework. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 35(1), 44–56. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10497315231201157>
- Friedman, D. A. (2025). *Researching second language classrooms: Qualitative and mixed methods approaches*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003155096>
- Garcia, M. (2026). Multilingual language learning in a multimodal metaverse: A multidimensional study of communicative, affective, and cognitive development. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2026.262126>

- 2
- Gempes, G. P., & Obenza, B. N. (2025). Integrating conceptual frameworks in mixed methods research: A guide to design and application. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies in Higher Education*, 2(3), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.70847/619380>
- Gumartifa, A., Sofendi, S., & Mirizon, S. (2025). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches, 5/E. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 13(1), 294–305. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v13i1.12934>
- Hafner, C. A., & Ho, W. Y. J. (2026). Doing digital multimodal composing with generative artificial intelligence: Towards an integrated critical digital literacies model. *Language Teaching Research*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688261459662>
- Haq, M., & Yasin, N. (2025). Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methodology paradigms. *Journal of Practical Studies in Education*, 6(6), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.46809/jpse.v6i6.144>
- Hsieh, J. K.-T., Gao, X., Nguyen, H. T. M., Yeh, Y.-F., & Lin, T.-B. (2026). Urban regional divides in Taiwanese teachers' interpretation and implementation of Bilingual 2030 policy. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2026.2619332>
- Ikegami, K., & Monteiro, E. (2026). Mixed methods, deeper meanings: Researching inclusion in a small territory. In *Handbook of mixed methods research in education* (pp. 196–214). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035326785.00023>
- Ivorgba, E. A. (2025). Multilingualism and multiliteracies in 21st-century education. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 9, 3243–3255. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.903SEDU0243>
- Jayanti, N. L. E., Sawitri, N. L. P. D., & Mantra, I. B. N. (2023). The correlation between simple present tense mastery and descriptive paragraph writing ability. *Academic Journal on English Studies (AJOES)*, 3(1), 48–56. <https://doi.org/10.58660/nextgen.v1i1.29>
- Jiang, L. G., & Hafner, C. (2024). Digital multimodal composing in L2 classrooms: A research agenda. *Language Teaching*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444824000107>
- Jiang, L., & Lai, C. (2025). How did the generative artificial intelligence-assisted digital multimodal composing process facilitate the production of quality digital multimodal compositions: Toward a process-genre integrated model. *TESOL Quarterly*, 59, S52–S85. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3390>
- Jing, Z., & Mahfoodh, O. H. A. (2026). Investigating the impact of digital multimodal composing on Chinese EFL learners' motivation. *Australian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9, Article 104059. <https://doi.org/10.29140/ajal.2026.104059>
- Johnstone, I. (2023). Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). *Yearbook of International Environmental Law*, 34(1), Article yvae026. <https://doi.org/10.1093/yiel/yvae026>
- Kalantzis, M., & Cope, B. (2005). A multiliteracies pedagogy: A pedagogical supplement. In *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203979402-22>
- Kalantzis, M., & Cope, B. (2025). Multiliteracies since social media and artificial intelligence. *Harvard Educational Review*, 95(1), 135–151. <https://doi.org/10.17763/1943-5045-95.1.135>
- Karkar-Esperat, T. M. (2025). Multiliteracies for multilingual learners: The MultiSemiotic Architecture Framework. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 28(2), 117–134. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2024.2409120>
- Lim, F. V. (2025). Multiliteracies in Singapore—A design-based educational research project. In *Læring og vurdering i den digitale skolen* (pp. 232–243). Scandinavian University Press. <https://doi.org/10.18261/9788215071305-25-13>
- Lim, F. V. (2026). Designing literacy learning with multimodality in the age of generative AI. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 29(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v29i1.694>
- Lim, F. V., & Tan-Chia, L. (2022). *Designing learning for multimodal literacy: Teaching viewing and representing*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003258513>
- Liu, D., Wen, R., Wu, C., & Li, J. (2025). Adults' eloquence literacy as a means of adapting to social transformation: A case study on adult literacy in Xi'an, China. In *Theory and practice in adult literacy, learning and social change: Theoretical insights and case studies from around the world* (p. 219). <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350400740.ch-11>
- Liu, K., & Diana Deris, F. (2023). Teachers' perceptions of communicative language teaching approach in English grammar teaching. *Arab World English Journal*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol14no3.8>
- 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>
- Meniado, J. C. (2025). Perspectives, practices, and issues in teaching multiliteracies in the

- Philippines. In *The Routledge handbook of English language education in the Philippines* (pp. 276–289). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781032621395-28>
- Miller, E. A., Reigh, E. V., & Mathis, C. (2026). Culturally relevant pedagogy in practice: A case study of a teacher's divergence from large-scale science curriculum. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 63(1), 6–21. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.70017>
- Misa, M. (2023). Multiliteracies pedagogy: A case study of critical reading in ELT classroom by implementing situated practice. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 11(2), 489–500. <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v11i2.7918>
- Mukungu, I., & Lyaka, M. (2026). Understanding phenomenological qualitative inquiry in information science and informatics research. In *Research methods for computing and informatics* (pp. 259–288). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-4018-9.ch008>
- Njeri Mugwe, J., & Runo, S. (2026). Methods and tools of data collection in nonexperimental designs II (qualitative approaches). In *Research methodology in agricultural sciences* (pp. 447–470). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-95-1892-0_19
- Ralston, N., Smith, R., & Dillon, H. (2025). Increasing confidence to implement culturally responsive teaching practices in higher education: Investigating the impacts of a book study for STEM educators. *Journal of Women and Minorities in Science and Engineering*, 31(3). <https://doi.org/10.1615/JWomenMinorScienEng.2024050410>
- Ramlo, S. (2025). Expanding the role of abduction in mixed methods research: Insights from Q methodology. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 15586898251397908.
- Saifulloh, A. I., Retnaningdyah, P., Mustofa, A., & Suhartono, S. (2025). Immersive situated practice within a local curriculum for hybrid learning. *Veredas Do Direito*, 22(5), Article e223587. <https://doi.org/10.18623/rvd.v22.n5.3587>
- Simos, C., Tzianakopoulou, T., Papachristou, A., Nestoratu, S., Galiotou, A., & Xyloparkioti, E. (2026). AI literacy and critical digital literacy in school practice: Collaborative digital writing as a cognitive and instructional model for 21st century learning. *Global Journal of Engineering and Technology Advances*, 26(3), 63–80. <https://doi.org/10.30574/gjeta.2026.26.3.0051>
- Sinaga, J. B., Saputro, I. E., Yulianingsih, L., Dewi, D. S., Subrata, D., & Ardhi, M. A. (2026). Developing local culture-based listening materials through digital storytelling. *Journal of Innovation in Educational and Cultural Research*, 7(2), 421–423. <https://doi.org/10.46843/jiecr.v7i2.2836>
- Slabko, V., Ostapchuk, T., Duliska, O., Roshchenkov, T., & Hibalo, O. (2026). Development of continuing education in the context of digitalization and global educational trends. *European Journal of Sustainable Development*, 15(1), Article 113. <https://doi.org/10.14207/ejsd.2026.v15n1p113>
- Tang, A. F., & Honeycutt, D. B. (2026). *Multiliteracies for generative artificial intelligence-assisted digital multimodal composing: A technology-in-practice approach*. <https://doi.org/10.64152/10125/73671>
- Tazkia, S., & Andriani, Z. Z. D. (2026). Students' engagement in learning recount text through TikTok-based projects: A senior high school case study. *IALLTEACH (Issues in Applied Linguistics & Language Teaching)*, 8(1), 8–13. <https://doi.org/10.37253/iallteach.v8i1.12142>
- Veliz, L., & Nguyen, M. H. (2026). Multiliteracies pedagogy: Teachers' interactive and reflexive positionings in EAL classrooms. *The Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, 49(1), 77–97. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44020-025-00090-0>
- Victor Lim, F., Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2026). Reimagining pedagogies for multiliteracies in the age of generative artificial intelligence. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 21(2), 155–166. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1554480X.2026.2655062>
- Wang, M., Dede, C., Grotzer, T. A., & Chen, J. (2025). Understanding and managing the complexities in situated learning in immersive virtual environments: M. Wang et al. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 73(5), 3177–3200. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-025-10519-5>
- Yu, S., Di Zhang, E., & Liu, C. (2026). Research into practice: Digital multimodal composition in second language writing. *Language Teaching*, 59(2), 197–213. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444824000375>
- Zhang, Y., Peng, J., & Zheng, Y. (2024). Teachers' perceptions of implementing digital multimodal composing in tertiary classrooms: Voices from Chinese EFL teachers. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 34(4), 1265–1282. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12560>