

Using Multiliteracies to Engage Learners to Produce Learning

Malini Ganapathy^{1*}

¹ English Language Department, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Penang, Malaysia.

* Corresponding author. Tel.: 60124315410; email: malinik@usm.my
Manuscript submitted November 10, 2014; accepted December 26, 2014.

Abstract: Students engage with different texts according to their social and private contexts which include web-based stories, interactive stories, hyper narratives in computer games, internet, podcasting, online news, e-mail, text messaging, MSN, Facebook, Twitter, Skype, and weblogs. These new practices fundamentally change perspectives of students' learning process in the classroom as they are being integrated as part of the global world through the mass media, internet, the multiplicity of communication channels and social networking. This paper discusses these changes and postulates key findings of a case study that investigated the effectiveness of the multiliteracies pedagogy in an ESL classroom in Malaysia. This study had documented a series of lessons using the multiliteracies approach which evaluated 37 Chinese ESL students' learning outcomes through the Peer Review Forms (PRF). The results gleaned from the PRF highlights the positive engagement of students' multimodal literacy practices and highlights the need for teachers to use Information and Communication Technologies as learning tools to promote positive learning outcomes which engage students' interest. The implications of this study suggest that the multiliteracies theory has the potential to advocate pedagogical practices that are engaging.

Keywords: Communication channels, multiliteracies approach, multimodal literacy practices, multiliteracies pedagogy.

1. Introduction

Today's education is perceived as a gateway to avenues that enables each individual to participate in various global debates, to make informed choices and a creative contribution that can empower not just individuals, but whole classes and communities towards nation-building [1]. In coping with the challenges of globalisation, the realities of today's global economic change impacts on the dynamic evolution of information and communication technology (ICT hereafter) and literacy evolution in the workplace. It is vital that these changes are addressed in educational settings to meet the current demands and challenges of various societies which are vital to ensure that education is relevant to global standards. The education curriculum should take this aspect into consideration in order to produce students who are knowledgeable, competent and possess attributes and skills which are necessary for the changing demands of the labour market.

The present age of information promotes a knowledge economy that focuses on the use of information and knowledge through innovation and creativity [2]. Additionally, the English language has grown to predominantly play a significant role whereby it is the linguistic mode in relation to the field of world economy and it is a medium to confront the challenges of corporate sectors, governments and technological

revolutions [3]. Malaysia's blueprint of its Tenth Malaysia Plan (2011-2015) is the national agenda to prepare students to compete in the global community. The Tenth Malaysia Plan focuses on "the aspirations of both the Government Transformation Programme and the New Economic Model, premised on high income, inclusiveness and sustainability.

To achieve Malaysia's aspirations, it is imperative to develop, attract and retain a first-world talent base" [4]. The human capital is perceived as holistic in nature where emphasis is placed on producing students who are well equipped with knowledge and skills that encompass science and technology, entrepreneurial capabilities, cultural values and other positive attributes. Hence, the talent base and workforce of high-income nations entail higher education qualifications to facilitate knowledge generation and innovation, high skill-levels in both technical and professional fields, and fruitful productivity. In relation to where popular culture, communications and media is an avenue for knowledge making, learners have to engage simultaneously with ICT and the resources of popular culture to reconceptualise the notion of plural cultures as part of literacy in education, workplace and in social life [5].

The present study intends to investigate the effects of Multiliteracies Approach (MLITA hereafter) whether it is able to address the challenges in a writing classroom by transforming conventional learning settings to more relevant learning environments that will be appropriate to the students' real world context to seek answers to the following research question:

- 1) What are students' perceptions of learning continuous writing using the Multiliteracies Approach?
- 2) To what extent are students engaged with the lessons?

2. Literature Review

In this vein, the Multiliteracies Approach (MLITA hereafter) to pedagogy constitutes the conceptual framework of this study, where the LBD model (LBDM hereafter) that is grounded in the Multiliteracies theory underlies this approach which is perceived as an educational response to current times [6]). In the LBDM, the Learning Element (LE hereafter) is introduced as a document that facilitates the teachers' planning of lessons based on the knowledge processes. This pedagogical approach that is advocated in this model through the knowledge processes, promotes higher order thinking skills and creative and innovative learning in the classroom where the emphasis is on addressing students' interest in learning.

This framework underlying the MLITA facilitates the usage of digital technologies during the learning process in the classroom. In the MLITA, literacy is not viewed as a single commodity as meaning is made in multimodal ways when ICTs are integrated in the teaching and learning process through the LE which is used as a lesson plan. The LE consists of knowledge processes that encourage various pedagogical repertoires of the teacher in terms of advocating creative learning practices. The MLITA is also perceived to be a framework that is relevant to current teaching practices as it engages and challenges all students in their learning, provides explicit teaching, makes learning relevant and ensures learner transformation [7].

2.1. Framing Multiliteracies in Education

The New London Group [8] assert that literacy pedagogy should connect with the changing social-economic environment, especially when the multiplicity of communications channels and increasing cultural and linguistic diversity in contemporary society promotes for broader perspectives of literacy than a narrow conception of language-based approaches. In coining the term multiliteracies, The New London Group [8] aimed to seek a more "equitable social and cultural participation that connects with the real world". "The plurality of literacy refers to the many ways in which literacy is employed and the many things with which it is associated in a community or society and throughout the life of an individual" [9].

Hence, the changing nature of communication, language and literacy in the workplace demands that important connections be made with educational settings to enhance curricular content and the knowledge,

competencies, attributes and skills required for the rapidly changing employment market. According to research [10], [11], it is critical to recognise broader notions of literacy as a result of new technologies which requires ICT skills to effectively engage in these new literacies that entail a range of inscription forms like spreadsheets, electronically - processed images and pictures, hypertexts, game interfaces, new storage and transmission modes like CDs, thumb drives and worldwide networking [12].

Reference [13] advance the term multiliteracies in their LBDM that advocates two distinctive features: the multiplicity of information and multimedia technologies and the salience of cultural and linguistic diversity. The concept of multiliteracies is intertwined with the developments experienced in our daily lives that define the new times, which brings forth experiences that connect the diverse living and learning experiences of humans and new ICTs. There is this realisation that a conventional interpretation of the term literacy referring to basic reading and writing skills is inadequate in the context of global and local movements in our living experiences and in turn in the arena of education and language development today.

2.2. The Multiliteracies Theory

The multiliteracies theory promotes the idea that knowledge and meaning are historically and socially located and thus can be considered as 'designed' artefacts. [13] construe design as a dynamic process, a process of subjective self-interest and transformation, consisting of:

- 1) The Designed (the available meaning-making resources, and patterns and conventions of meaning in a particular cultural context);
- 2) Designing (the process of shaping emergent meaning which involves re presentation and recontextualisation—this never involves a simple repetition of The Designed because every moment of meaning involves the transformation of the Available Designs of meaning);
- 3) The Redesigned (the outcome of designing, something through which the meaning-maker has remade themselves and created a new meaning-making resource—it is in this sense that we are truly designers of our social futures).

Reference [13] stress that multiliteracies is grounded in the increasing complexity and connectivity of various modes of meaning, where language is linked to other modes of meaning. They have determined specific "areas in which functional 'grammars'- metalanguages which describe and explain patterns of meaning—are required: Linguistic Design, Visual Design, Audio Design, Gestural Design, Spatial Design and Multimodal Design, in which meanings are made in relation to different modes of meaning. Particularly with the rise of new ICTs, these different modes of meaning are increasingly interrelated—in email, in desktop publishing, in video and in multimedia and hypermedia. This means that literacy teaching has to move well beyond its old, disciplinary boundaries".

2.3. The Pedagogy of Multiliteracies

In terms of operationalising the multiliteracies theory into perspectives of pedagogy, teaching and learning is perceived as comprising four orientations which are currently practised. These orientations include the design of meaning which should integrate a combination of Situated Practice, Overt Instruction, Critical Framing and Transformed Practice. [13] elaborate on these pedagogies as follows in Fig. 1.

The pedagogy of LBD comprises the eight 'Knowledge Processes' where every knowledge process represents a distinct way of making knowledge and learning. It is within the capacity of the teacher to select any knowledge process which does not necessarily correlate with the sequence.

When learning takes place in the LBDM, there are different 'movements or moments in the learning process. When the lessons are in progress, if the teacher is able to identify the knowledge processes, learner engagement can be determined. Thus, the teacher is able to gauge if the learning outcomes are achieved.

Learning by Design Model (Knowledge Process)	Multiliteracies Pedagogy
Experiencing	<i>Situated Practice</i> Immersion in experience and the utilization of available discourses, including those from the students' varied worlds.
Conceptualising	<i>Overt Instruction</i> Systematic, analytic and conscious understanding. The introduction of an explicit language to describe the design of meaning.
Analysing	<i>Critical Framing</i> Interpreting the social and cultural context of particular designs of meaning; standing back from meanings and viewing them critically in relation to their purposes and cultural context.
Applying	<i>Transformed Practice</i> Transfer in meaning-making practice which puts the transformed meaning to work in other context or cultural sites.

Fig. 1. Mapping the multiliteracies pedagogy with knowledge process in the learning by design model.

Cope & Kalantzis [13] reiterate that the four aspects of the multiliteracies pedagogy is to supplement the various existing traditional teaching practices. The multiliteracies case is that all four aspects of pedagogy are vital to promote good teaching. They stress that when all four aspects of pedagogies are integrated, each pedagogy has the potential to complement the other.

The LBDM paves way for teachers to design their teaching to address the needs of “today’s increasingly multimodal communications environment” [6]) and this is vital to meet students’ learning needs. The following modes of meanings can be selected by teachers when planning their activities in the LE [6]:

- *Written Language*: writing (representing meaning to another) and reading (representing meaning to oneself)—handwriting, the printed page, the screen.
- *Oral Language*: live or recorded speech (representing meaning to another); listening (representing meaning to oneself).
- *Visual Representation*: still or moving image, sculpture, craft (representing meaning to another); view, vista, scene, perspective (representing meaning to oneself).
- *Audio Representation*: music, ambient sounds, noises, alerts (representing meaning to another); hearing, listening (representing meaning to oneself).
- *Tactile Representation*: touch, smell and taste: the representation to oneself of bodily sensations and feelings or representations to others which ‘touch’ them bodily. Forms of tactile representation

include kinaesthesia, physical contact, skin sensations (heat/cold, texture, pressure), grasp, manipulable objects, artefacts, cooking and eating, aromas.

- *Gestural Representation*: movements of the hands and arms, expressions of the face, eye movements and gaze, demeanours of the body, gait, clothing and fashion, hair style, dance, action sequences, timing, frequency, ceremony and ritual. Here gesture is understood broadly and metaphorically as a physical act of signing (as in 'a gesture to ...'), rather than the narrower literal meaning of hand and arm movement. Representation to oneself may take the form of feelings and emotions or rehearsing action sequences in one's mind's eye.
- *Spatial Representation*: proximity, spacing, layout, interpersonal distance, territoriality, architecture/building, streetscape, cityscape, landscape.

3. Methodology

This study is based on only one Form Four ESL class of a Chinese school and limited to one action research teacher who conducted the writing lessons using the MLITA. However, a case study research design enabled the in-depth analysis of the classroom context in which the intervention occurred and be able to sustain the description of intervention itself.

This case study design employs the MLITA in the ESL classroom which specifically applies the Multiliteracies theory underlying the LBDM and integrates the process approach to the teaching of continuous writing.

The procedure was carried out in a Chinese secondary co-ed school in Penang, Georgetown. The Principal of the Chinese secondary school where the study was carried out had requested the cooperation of the researchers in terms of maintaining the confidentiality of the school's identity. Hence, it was mutually agreed that details of the schools identity will be kept confidential as a measure to safeguard the well-being of the teachers and students who were participants of this study. The Chinese secondary school where this study was conducted will be labeled as school A.

3.1. Sample Population

The students from school A which is a Chinese vernacular school have to master three languages which are Bahasa Melayu, the first official language, English the second official language and Mandarin which is their medium of instruction. The sample for this study was chosen based on purposive sampling. The class of Form Four students was selected by the Head of the English Panel in mutual agreement with the school Principal as this study was perceived as an avenue for these Chinese ESL students to improve their writing skills, in order to perform well in their SPM exam the following year. The science students from the average class were identified by the Head of the English Panel as the sample deemed appropriate for the study. The streaming of classes are based on students' PMR results where the above average classes consist of students who scored straight As in all the subjects and the average classes consists of students scoring grades B and C for the various subjects. Hence, the average classes chosen for this study comprise of a mixed ability group of students in terms of their writing proficiency where this classes consists of above average, average and weak students in writing.

In an initial interview with the experienced Head of the English Panel at the school, it was found that students in school A were not interested in their writing activities and were passive during their lessons. There is always a large disparity between students' results for the SPM English subject and 1119 English subject and this was due to students' weaknesses in writing. The Head of the English Panel and teachers who were interviewed expressed their enthusiasm to be participants of this study, in the hope of benefitting in terms of getting to know the study's conceptual framework.

3.2. Research Tool

The Peer Review Form (PRF hereafter) is adapted from the Design Guide [13]. Peer review is a significant element in assisting students to improve their writing [14]. When using the PRF, students are assessing each other's work in groups during the presentation session. The action research teacher had segregated the students according to mixed ability groups to carry out the various activities in the pre-writing stage. The rationale was that the above average and average students will assist the weaker students during the MLITA's group activities. Each group consisted of an above average student, two average students and one below average student and there were eight groups consisting of this composition. As the class comprised of 37 students, the ninth group had an extra of one below average student. The objective of grouping the students was to facilitate group work. While one group is presenting their work at the pre-writing stage, there will be 8 other groups assessing the group's work by using the PRF. Each LE has one stage of assessment by peers which totals up to 72 sets of PRF (9 groups x 8 sets of presentations).

3.3. Research Procedures

Firstly, the action research teacher who is the ESL teacher as identified by the Head of the English Panel had taught various essay skills to the Form Four students (Pilot Study and Main Study) from January 2010 and until March 2010, which is vital in terms of fulfilling the writing requirements in the SPM writing component. These pedagogical aspects encompass the basic structure of writing an essay which includes the pre-writing activities, writing of the paragraph framework; thesis statements, topic sentences and unity and coherence in essay writing.

In the two months (February and March), the teacher introduced students to the writing process, audience and purpose and pre-writing techniques to generate ideas. Students were later guided through the paragraph writing process of planning, writing thesis statements, generating ideas, topic sentences, unity and coherence within a paragraph, organising, and pointers on making smooth transitions and revising. Writing skills on sentence variety and language awareness was also taught based on paragraph editing exercises. These skills were practised through a set of exercises and sample assignment questions.

The English continuous writing syllabus specifications (Curriculum Specifications, 2003) advocate the teaching of the six writing genres in Form Four which include descriptive, narrative, argumentative, factual, reflective and free style essays. Hence, the researcher had taken this aspect into consideration for the purpose of this study where all the writing genres were exposed to the ESL students by the action research teacher during the MLITA's continuous writing lessons. The six continuous writing essay questions which were used in this study were adapted from past year SPM questions with the permission obtained from the Malaysian Examination Board.

The content area/topics for the teaching and learning sessions in this study aligned closely to the English language Curriculum Specifications (2003) underlying the Integrated Curriculum for Secondary School level (KBSM). The LEs were planned in accordance to the conceptual framework of the MLITA and the duration of the implementation was seven months (May-October, 2013). Each LE took approximately one month to complete. In each LE at the pre-writing stage, after students were exposed to the features of each essay genre, a continuous writing essay question was given to the students on an individual basis during a double period ESL writing lesson. The duration to complete this essay was one hour. The objective of this method was to gauge individual students' writing performance in terms of their composite scores after the implementation of the six LEs at the end of the research. The same ESL teacher, who is the action research teacher, carried out the writing lessons based on the MLITA's pedagogical framework advocated in this study and as outlined in each LE.

All the activities in the LEs were collaboratively carried out by the mixed ability students in various

groups. The action research teacher ensured that the presentations in the pre-writing stage, reflected students' multimodal literacy practices in 'Looking' (Experiencing knowledge), 'Connecting' (Conceptualising knowledge), 'Thinking' (Analysing knowledge), 'Doing Things' (Applying knowledge) and 'Expression' (Multiliteracies). The PRF was used in groups to assess each other's group work.

4. Findings

The results in this section are in reference to the findings of peer review carried out by the nine groups during the MLITA writing activities of each LE. The aim of the PRF is to mainly facilitate the tracking of students' performance level in gauging if they are able to think and act with assistance, think and act independently or perform the activities collaboratively. The results of the PRF will determine the effect of the MLITA on students' continuous writing performance.

The results in this section are in reference to the findings of peer review carried out by the nine groups during the MLITA writing activities of each LE. The aim of the PRF is to mainly facilitate the tracking of students' performance level in gauging if they are able to think and act with assistance, think and act independently or perform the activities collaboratively. The results of the PRF will determine the effect of the MLITA on students' continuous writing performance.

4.1. Results of Knowing Things by 'Looking' (Experiential Knowledge)

Table 1. Students' Ability to Demonstrate Experiencing Knowledge by 'Looking' When Presenting in Groups

Assessment scale	Frequency	Percent
Excellent (16-20)	234	54.2
Good (12-15)	153	35.4
Average (6-11)	45	10.4
Total	432	100.0

A total of 54.2% of group work activities was 'excellent' in demonstrating students' ability to look and express about their world. This was based on their experiential knowledge which refers to their previous knowledge in reflecting on what they have learnt about a new knowledge of the topic by applying it in the new learning context. Hence, during the MLITA lessons, students were able to use their prior knowledge to relate to the essay topic in a relevant way and this displayed students' ability to have researched for the ideas collaboratively. In this perspective, 35.4% of groups work achieved 'good' and 10.4% were rated as 'average'.

Table 2. Various Group Performances on Knowing Things by 'Looking'

Performance	Frequency	Percent
Level 1: With Help	62	14.4
Level 2: Themselves	136	31.5
Level 3: Help Others	234	54.2
Total	432	100.0

Peers reviewed a total of 54.2% of students' work as level 3 where the group activities were able to demonstrate students' collaborative competence in producing excellent presentations of relevant thesis statements, topic sentences and supporting details according to the various topics. 136 activities of groups had achieved autonomous competence (level 2) and another 62 groups' work was assessed as level 1 where some students needed explicit instruction from the teacher or peers to be able to undertake the activity.

4.2. Results of Knowing Things by 'Connecting' (Conceptual Knowledge)

Table 3. Students' Ability to Conceptualise Knowledge by 'Connecting'

Assessment Scale	Frequency	Percent
Excellent (16-20)	234	54.2
Good (12-15)	153	35.4
Average (6-11)	45	10.4
Total	432	100.0

Table 3 illustrates the results of students' assessment of their peers' presentations, if they were able to understand the requirements of the essay topic after researching well and presenting relevantly. Majority (54.2%) of the groups were rated as excellent in fulfilling their tasks while another 35.4% of groups' work was deemed as 'good' in this aspect and 10.4% were rated as 'average' by peers.

Table 4. Various Groups' Demonstration of Knowing Things by 'Connecting'

Performance	Frequency	Percent
Level 1: With Help	70	16.2
Level 2: Themselves	121	28.0
Level 3: Help Others	241	55.8
Total	432	100.0

Table 4 highlights the groups' performance level for 'connecting' where 241 groups' activities were rated by their peers as level 3 in which they were able to work effectively with their peers of mixed ability to produce 'excellent' pieces of work. Another 121 groups' work was rated as demonstrating autonomous competence as they were able to figure out how to undertake the activity collaboratively and complete it successfully. 70 groups' presentations were found to be categorised as level 1 performance where groups were dependent on explicit instruction.

4.3. Results of Knowing Things by 'Thinking' (Analytical Knowledge)

The majority (59%) of groups' work demonstrated that students had sufficient knowledge about the essay topics and the various issues underlying it through the construction of thesis statements, topic sentences and supporting details. In this light, 31.5% of groups' work was rated as 'good' and another 9.5%

were rated as 'average' in their ability to demonstrate the thinking element.

Table 5. Students' Ability to Analyze Knowledge by 'Thinking'

Assessment Scale	Frequency	Percent
Excellent (16-20)	255	59.0
Good (12-15)	136	31.5
Average (6-11)	41	9.5
Total	432	100.0

Table 6. Shows the Various Performances of Groups

Performance	Frequency	Percent
Level 1: With Help	70	16.2
Level 2: Themselves	109	25.2
Level 3: Help Others	253	58.6
Total	432	100.0

In relation to the performance levels of the various groups, 58.6% of students' work demonstrated their ability to achieve collaborative competence (level 3), while another 25.2% of group work was assessed as demonstrating autonomous competence (level 2) in carrying out the activities and 16.2% of groups demonstrated assisted competence (level 1) in completing the various activities.

4.4. Results of Knowing Things by 'Doing Things' (Applied Knowledge)

Table 7. Highlights the Nine Groups' Ability to Demonstrate Applied Knowledge Accurately

Assessment Scale	Frequency	Percent
Excellent (16-20)	255	59.0
Good (12-15)	136	31.5
Average (6-11)	41	9.5
Total	432	100.0

Majority (59%) of the groups' presentations were rated as interesting and well done by peers in relation to students' ability in excellently carrying out the various writing activities by presenting the thesis statements, topic sentences and supporting details that relevantly fulfill the requirements of the various essay genres. In this vein, 31.5% of group work was deemed good and another 9.5% of groups was average in 'doing things'.

Similar to other findings in this section, majority (58.3%) of groups were able to demonstrate level 3 performance where there was collaborative competence among peers when carrying out the various

activities. Another 27.8% of groups achieved level 2 and 13.9% were rated as level 1 in performing the activities collaboratively.

Table 8. Students' Group Performance Levels

Performance	Frequency	Percent
Level 1: With Help	60	13.9
Level 2: Themselves	120	27.8
Level 3: Help Others	252	58.3
Total	432	100.0

4.5. Results of 'Expression' (Multiliteracies)

Table 9. The Results of 'Expression'

Assessment Scale	Frequency	Percent
Excellent (16-20)	253	58.6
Good (12-15)	149	34.5
Average (6-11)	30	6.9
Total	432	100.0

Table 9 illustrates peers rating of each other's' group activities in terms of expression, whether they had communicated their thesis statements, topic sentences and supporting details effectively. A total of 253 group activities were rated as 'excellent' in this PRF criterion. Another 149 activities were rated 'good' (34.5%) and a small percentage (6.9%) of group work was deemed as 'average' in demonstrating their work through graphics, sounds and other non-linear elements.

4.6. Results of Overall Group Performance Scores

Table 10. Overall Performance Scores

Assessment Scale	Frequency	Percent
Excellent (16-20)	264	61.1
Good (12-15)	155	35.9
Average (6-11)	13	3.0
Total	432	100.0

The findings of the PRF determine the extent to which the MLITA affects students' writing performance. In analysing the overall scores, a significant majority of groups' (61.1%) work demonstrated excellence and another 35.9% were rated as good in 'looking', 'connecting', thinking', 'doing things' and 'expression' which determines the significant extent to which the MLITA affects students' writing performance as they were

able to present their thesis statements, topic sentences and supporting details effectively through the various writing activities. Besides that, the majority of the groups were able to achieve collaborative competence (level 3) in carrying out the activities and this is reflective of their abilities to work with one another to achieve 'excellent' pieces of work. A relatively high percentage demonstrated their ability to achieve autonomous competence (level 2) within their group members as they worked together cooperatively during the various activities, to present their work in accordance to the essay topics.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

The PRF findings are statistically significant in favour of the positive effect of the MLITA on students' continuous writing performance. Majority of the group work was rated by their peers as demonstrating 'excellence' in effectively presenting relevant thesis statements, substantial topic sentences and supporting details that portray their understanding and requirements of the essay genre and topic.

The conceptual framework of this study takes into account the PRF as an instrument to gauge the learning outcomes of LE 1 to LE 6, where peer feedback is beneficial in terms of its impact and effectiveness and which has been substantiated by a number of empirical studies [15]-[18]. The significant results of the PRF clearly showcase the positive effects of the MLITA on students' continuous writing performance which relates to [19] claim that ESL students require exposure to pedagogical approaches that enable them to cope with their learning environment and bridge the "educational parity with native English speakers" [20], 21] and [22]. This relates to [23] theory underlying the socio-cultural theory advocated in this conceptual framework where collaborative activity encourages students to function within the proximal ZPD which determines the achievement of learning outcomes and high academic performance.

Therefore, the multiliteracies theory takes into account various literacy practices which are needed for work and leisure, citizenship and community engagement, personal development and in the cultural context [24]. [25] construes technology "as part of a complex form of interactions with students, sometimes providing ideas, sometimes providing a resource for enquiry and sometimes supporting creativity".

The positive engagement of students' multimodal literacy practices of this study provides insights on students' interest in their writing lessons and teachers' positive perceptions. The findings of this study confirm that when students are motivated and interested in their lessons, the learning outcomes are productive. Hence, the implication of this finding makes it important that the current pedagogical repertoires of teachers which encompass an approach that is 'teacher-centred', 'chalk and talk' and 'textbook-oriented' have to be revamped to align the teaching and learning of writing to adhere to the blueprint of the Tenth Malaysia Plan .

The significant implication of this study highlights that the MLITA is viable and effective as a pedagogical approach in the ESL writing classroom and hence, this study confirms the importance of this approach to be considered for current ESL classroom pedagogy and future curriculum orientations. The findings of this study correlates with the findings of previous studies [26]-[32] and emphasizes on the factors that need to be taken into consideration when using the MLITA to enhance writing performance. These factors are relevant and encompass practical considerations that are vital in ensuring the effectiveness of implementing the MLITA in the ESL writing classroom. However, the factors that impact the teaching and learning outcomes of the MLITA can be improvised or adapted to suit the teaching and learning of other ESL related skills in order to ensure that the learning outcomes are achieved successfully.

References

- [1] Pullen, D. L., & Cole, D. L. (2010). *Multiliteracies and Technology Enhanced Education: Social Practise and the Global Classroom*. United Kingdom: Routledge.

- [2] Leino, K. (2006). Reality the web-students' perceptions about the internet. *Scandinavian Journal of Education Research*, 50(5), 541-557.
- [3] Menkhoff, T., & Bengtsson, M. L. (2011). Engaging students in higher education through mobile learning: An Asian perspective. Exploring Leadership and Learning Theories in Asia Conference, Penang, Malaysia, 15-17 February 2011.
- [4] The Economic Planning Unit, Prime Minister's Department. (2010). Tenth Malaysia plan. Putrajaya: Malaysia.
- [5] Lie, K. Y. (2005). Pluliteracy in diverse contexts: Literacy practices around pluralistic texts. In A. Pandian, M. K. Kabilan, & S. Kaur (Eds.), *Teachers, Practices and Supportive Cultures* (pp. 226-236). Serdang: Universiti Putra Malaysia Press.
- [6] Kalantzis, M., & Cope, B. (2005). *Learning By Design*. Melbourne, VIC: Victorian Schools Innovation Commission/Common Ground.
- [7] Van, H. (2005). Effective teaching and learning, pedagogy and multiliteracies. In M. Kalantzis & B. Cope (Eds.), *Learning by Design* (pp. 257-284). Melbourne: Common Ground.
- [8] The New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(1), 60-92.
- [9] UNESCO (2006). Education for All Global Monitoring Report. Retrieved October 17, 2010, from http://www.unesco.org/education/GMR2006/full/chapt1_eng.pdf
- [10] Jr. Leu, D. J., & Leu, D. D. (2000). *Teaching with the Internet: Lessons from the Classroom* (3rd ed.). Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.
- [11] Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2006). *New Literacies: Everyday Practices and Classroom Learning*. London: Open University Press.
- [12] Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (1997). *Productive Diversity: A New Approach to Work and Management*. Sydney: Pluto.
- [13] Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2000). Introduction multiliteracies: The beginnings of an ideas. In B. Cope & M. Kalantzis (eds.). *Multiliteracies: Literacy Learning and the Design of Social Futures* (pp. 3-8). South Yarra, Australia: MacMillan Publishers.
- [14] San, N. Y., Lee, H., Didi, N., & Esteller, O. R. (2010). Students' perception on peer reviews in the foreign language writing classroom. International Conference on Linguistics, Literature, and Culture. Penang, Malaysia. 1-2 June, 2010.
- [15] Min, H. T. (2006). The effects of trained peer review on EFL students' revision types and writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15(3), 118-141.
- [16] Paulus, T. M. (1999). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3(8), 265-289.
- [17] Tsui, A. B. M., & Maria, N. G. (2000). Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments? *Journal of Second Language Writers*, 2(6), 147-170.
- [18] Villamil, O. S. & Guerrero, M. D. (1998). Assessing the impact of peer revision on L2 writing. *Applied Linguistics*, 4(3), 491-514.
- [19] Tan. J. P.-L., & McWilliam, E. (2009). From literacy to multiliteracies: Diverse learners and pedagogical practice. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 4(3), 213-225.
- [20] Grant, R. A., & Wong, S. D. (2003). Barriers to literacy for language-minority learners: An argument for change in the literacy education profession. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 46 (7), 386-394.
- [21] McWilliam, E. D., McArdle, F. K., & Mazzei, L. (2009). *Voicing Objections, Voice in Qualitative Inquiry: Challenging Conventional, Interpretive, and Critical Conceptions in Qualitative Research* (pp. 63-76). Routledge: New York.

- [22] Tan, K. E., (2006). Writing English essays within dominant discourses in Malaysian schools. *Jurnal Pendidik dan Pendidikan*, 21(3), 23-45.
- [23] Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- [24] O'Rourke, M. (2005). Multiliteracies for 21st century schools. *ANSN Snapshot Number 2*. The Australian National Schools Network Ltd.
- [25] Somekh, B. (2007). *Pedagogy and Learning with ICT. Researching the Art of Innovation*. Great Britain: Routledge.
- [26] Shuhaimi, A. S. (2004). Multiliteracies: An exploratory study on the use of the multiliteracies approach in the teaching of English in selected perak schools. Master of Arts, Universiti Sains Malaysia.
- [27] Grabill, J., & Hicks, T. (2005). Multiliteracies meet methods: The case for digital writing in English education. *English Education*, 37(4), 301-311.
- [28] Pandian, A., & Balraj, S. (2005). Approaching learning by design as an agenda for Malaysian schools. In M. Kalantzis, & B. Cope (Eds.), *Learning by Design* (pp. 283-313). Melbourne: Common Ground Publishing.
- [29] Neville, M. (2005). Innovation in Queensland education: Multiliteracies in action. In M. Kalantzis, & B. Cope (Eds.), *Learning by Design* (pp 231-256). Melbourne: Common Ground.
- [30] Burrows, P. (2005). The emergence of pedagogical mentors: The project-consultants. In M. Kalantzis, & B. Cope (Eds.), *Learning by Design* (pp. 177-196). Melbourne: Common Ground Publishing.
- [31] Ganapathy, M. (2007). Using the multiliteracies approach to promote learner engagement in an EFL classroom: A case study in a selected school in Penang. Unpublished thesis submitted in fulfillment of Master of Arts. University Sains Malaysia, Malaysia.
- [32] Tan, J. P., & Mc William, E. (2009). From literacy to multiliteracies: diverse learners and pedagogical practice. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 4(3), 213-225.



Malini Ganapathy was born in Penang, Georgetown in 1970. She obtained a teaching certificate in 1995 with a major in English language studies from Tuanku Bainun Teacher's Training College, Penang, Malaysia in 1995. Then she graduated with a degree in bachelor of education (Hons, 2nd Class Upper) in English language & literature studies from Universiti Sains Malaysia, Penang in 2004. She graduated with the masters of arts in English language studies from Universiti Sains Malaysia, Penang in 2008. In 2012, she completed a Ph.D in applied linguistics and graduated from

Universiti Sains Malaysia, Penang.

She has teaching experience in high schools with the Ministry of Education for 15 years and 10 years experience teaching part time with Open University Malaysia. Currently, she is a lecturer at the School of Languages, Literacies and Translation, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Penang, Malaysia. Her areas of expertise include literacies, teaching and learning English as a second language (TESL), writing, and literature in English. She has published in these areas especially in journals and books chapters. Besides that, she presented her research at international conferences.

Dr. Malini is currently a senior member of the International Economics Development Research Center.