



# Reading, Listening, Viewing: Multimodal Practices for English Learners

Nicole King, Afida Safriani, Youngjoo Yi

## Introduction

First and second language (L2) research and pedagogy have increasingly discussed the possibilities and challenges of multimodal practices for teaching and learning. For instance, in 2005 the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) executive committee issued a position statement on multimodal literacies (literacy practices using multiple modes of communication and expression, like text, image, and sound). L2 research has revealed that engaging in multimodal practices enables English learners (ELs) to improve academic language and literacy, increase content knowledge and critical awareness, negotiate social identities, and clarify expression (Ajayi, 2008; Danzak, 2011; Early & Marshall, 2008; Skinner & Hagood, 2008; Yi & Choi, 2015). More recently, *TESOL Quarterly* published a special issue titled “Multimodality: Out From the Margins of English Language Teaching,” highlighting “the possibilities, challenges, and understandings that a multimodal lens brings to language education” (Early, Kendrick, & Potts, 2015, p. 451). Acknowledging the possibilities of multimodal practices for student learning, the U.S. Common Core State Standards (CCSS) Initiative recognizes the importance of incorporating multimodal texts into teaching and of engaging students in responding to and creating multimodal texts while communicating with a wide range of audiences (Beach, Thein, & Webb, 2015). Given these affordances, it is apt for TESOL professionals to engage in dialogues about ways to integrate multimodal literacy practices into teaching ELs and into our own professional learning. In this chapter, we offer a detailed lesson plan to illustrate ways in which teachers can integrate multimodal literacy practices through both digital and nondigital media (e.g., multimedia videos, picture books, print, and online comic creators) into a sixth-grade English language arts (ELA) classroom by drawing upon a recent study by Choi and Yi (2016) on teachers’ integration of multimodality into classroom practices for ELs. By connecting Choi and Yi’s research to our lesson planning, we attempt to showcase how we can put research into practice.

We designed this lesson plan to address the teaching and learning context of a middle school in a large urban district in the Midwestern United States. The focal classroom comprised 30 students (including four ELs), an ELA teacher, and an EL teacher who provided inclusive support to culturally and linguistically diverse students for 90-minute

periods daily. Within the entire school district, a total of 89 languages are spoken in the homes of the students, with Spanish representing the greatest proportion of these languages, after English. Also, on average, the majority of students within a class of 30 receive free or reduced lunch, indicating a socioeconomic status at or slightly below the poverty line; 70% of students in the district receive meal assistance. However, the demographics of a school, or even a classroom, do not provide a holistic representation of the capabilities of the students.

Given the cultural and linguistic “funds of knowledge” (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & González, 1992) within the homes of the students, lesson planning requires careful examination of motivating, engaging, and purposeful modeling, teaching, and learning. The content ELA and the EL teacher harness the motivating and engaging affordances of digital multimodal literacy practices. Digital multimodal literacy practices and instruction allow teachers to create innovative and student-centered instruction and formative assessments. Many students bring into the classroom expertise in technological platforms that lend themselves to application in narrative, expository, and persuasive assignments (e.g., iMovie). The students’ familiarity, along with an excitement to utilize their expertise, has helped teachers explore the possibilities of using multimodal instruction that is theoretically grounded, research based, and standard driven.

For instance, the lesson plan that follows on “The Legend of Sleepy Hollow” (Irving, 1863) is situated at the end of a larger unit of fictional and nonfictional writing representing the time period before and after the Revolution of the United States in 1776; it is built upon ideas within the Sixth Grade Curriculum Guide, which serves as a guideline of instruction for local sixth-grade teachers (Ohio Department of Education, 2015a). Other examples of literature studied during this first unit of study of the school year include the Preamble to the United States Constitution (1787) and Longfellow’s poem, “Paul Revere’s Ride” (Longfellow & Bing, 2001). By fully embracing multimodal instruction and literacy practices, this lesson allows students to experience daily life through early fantasy of the New England region of the United States after the conclusion of the American Revolution. Given the historical and semantic context of each of the texts within this unit, an interdisciplinary study with the social studies content teacher would occur.

## Synopsis of Original Research

Choi, J., & Yi, Y. (2016). Teachers’ integration of multimodality into classroom practices for English language learners. *TESOL Journal*, 7, 304–327. doi:10.1002/tesj.204

Choi and Yi’s (2016) study detailed teachers’ strategic efforts to incorporate and reflect on multimodality in their content area classes as they pedagogically supported ELs. Two focal teachers in the study, Jude and Savanna,<sup>1</sup> represented teachers who had limited experience in teaching ELs; nevertheless, their practice of multimodal teaching within the existing curriculum helped ELs “gain nuanced understanding of subject-matter content knowledge, powerfully express what they learned, and discover a psychological refuge” (p. 304). The noteworthy circumstances of their multimodal teaching practices are (1) the inclusive settings in which teachers Jude and Savanna coherently integrated multimodality into a thematic unit of the content-area classes, and (2) the contrastive levels of confidence with multimodality between Jude (more confident) and Savanna

---

<sup>1</sup>Teacher and student names are pseudonyms.

(less confident) as likely representative of teachers' authentic experience with and confidence using multimodality.

Situated within a culturally diverse urban school with 55% low socioeconomic students and 14% ELs, Jude integrated multimodality into her fourth-grade social studies class in the teaching and learning of The Revolutionary War unit. She designed a 1-month lesson according to the district curriculum and organized activities that allowed students to be able to configure multiple modes of representation (e.g., drawings, audio recording, and digital animation character making) in their creation of booklets and newspapers. In practice, Jude paired up ELs and non-ELs and assigned them to draw a character of a loyalist or a patriot, write a diary entry that reflected the character, and (with Jude's assistance) scan the drawings and digitally record the narratives using Blabberize ([www.blabberize.com](http://www.blabberize.com); a website that allows the user to add voice-over to uploaded pictures). In Jude's reflection of her multimodal teaching experience, she described the development of learning by her Spanish-speaking student, Beth, as "a more nuanced understanding about sophisticated historical concepts" (p. 313) and a powerful expression of her voice through multimodal engagements. Given that Beth did not have the same access to digital technology at home, the inclusion of multimodal practices in Jude's class provided her with a space to explore the potential of digital composition, which in turn enhanced her content knowledge.

Meanwhile, Savanna taught in a third-grade English to speakers of other languages push-in class in a school that consisted of 77% native Spanish speakers. Within a thematic unit, The Character of Heroes, she integrated multimodality into the teaching of poetry writing that simultaneously addressed the learning standards of language arts and social studies. Using gestures and movement to illustrate vocabulary, she scaffolded the students' writing tasks. During composition of biographical and autobiographical poems, students visually expressed their new lexical items through Wordle ([www.wordle.net](http://www.wordle.net); a website that creates a visual word cloud of supplied lexical terms) and created PowerPoint slides for their print-based poems. Savanna video recorded the students working on their projects and reciting their poems so that she could present the students' work, confidence, and creativity to parents. Harnessing multimodal teaching and learning practices, Savanna provided a space for ELs to creatively illustrate new vocabulary, displaying linguistic understanding, beyond that of their current unimodal linguistic abilities. In doing so, Savanna successfully leveraged her students' cognitive and affective connection to the lesson.

The study has significantly contributed to the literature on multimodality by exploring how teachers utilize multimodality in classroom settings and what teachers perceive as the affordances of and challenges to their efforts. Through qualitative analysis of how teachers utilize multimodality throughout lesson implementation, Choi and Yi's (2016) study sheds light on how multimodality enhances ELs' content understanding and engenders a sense of productivity and authorship.

## Rationale

We were initially drawn to the article by Choi and Yi (2016) because of its clear connection and further exploration between teacher education and teacher practice; the researchers articulate the importance of engaging teachers "by using the same approaches [they] hope [the teachers] will use with K–12 students" (p. 305). This statement allowed for a kinship to develop in the shared purpose of engaging students meaningfully and with a focus on promoting the assets of students in multimodal, and often digital multimodal,

literacy practices. Our affiliation with this anchor text continued with particular focus on an article by Miller (2007), mentioned early in the article. Miller’s study, in a native-language context, concluded with pedagogical implications on the potentialities of digital multimodal literacies connecting the curriculum to the lived experiences of the students; scaffolding the accessibility of multimodal media production; and leveraging the positionality of all students to one of confidence, efficacy, and productivity (p. 79). Choi and Yi built upon these conclusions and extended them into an L2 context using qualitative analysis of the multimodal practices of in-service teachers of ELs.

Apart from the similarity in shared purpose and focus on promoting the affordances of multimodal literacy practices with our students, Choi and Yi (2016) guide their readers toward the process of implementing such literacy practices in classrooms. A significant example on the process of implementation was detailed in their description of Rance-Roney’s (2010) article, “Jump-Starting Language and Schema for English-Language Learners: Teacher-Composed Digital Jumpstarts for Academic Readings.” Though Choi and Yi describe the purposes of the 3- to 6-minute digitally mediated multimodal videos pertaining to “pre-reading activities, addressing vocabulary, syntax, reading strategies, and cultural and linguistic schema” (p. 307), we were able to further appreciate this digital multimodal literacy practice by reading Rance-Roney’s original piece. One of the examples Rance-Roney provides to explain the importance of digital jumpstart videos pertains to a lesson on Miller’s (1976) play, *The Crucible: A Play in Four Acts*, which takes place in Colonial Massachusetts. Thus, the strategy of using a digitally mediated multimodal video to provide students with understanding of the context, cultural practices, and semantics of a similar time and place to our focal text provided even further support for the necessity to implement the multimodal literacy practices detailed by Choi and Yi with our potential students.

Finally, Choi and Yi (2016) provide the progression of two teachers in their use of multimodal literacy practices. One teacher, Jude, is a fourth-grade social studies and science content teacher of both ELs and non-ELs; Savanna is an EL teacher who provides inclusion services. Thus, the contexts between the two teachers in the anchor text have congruence to our setting of a sixth-grade ELA content teacher and an EL teacher who provides push-in EL services. Thus, Choi and Yi’s teaching philosophy, the digital multimodal literacy practices implemented in the original research (e.g., digital animation character making), the content-area subject matter, and the teaching contexts provided many similarities to our teaching and learning context. These similarities resulted in our developing the following lesson plan.

## Lesson Plan

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Lesson Plan Title</b>  | Reading, Listening, Viewing: Multimodal Practices for English Learners                                  |
| <b>Grade/Subject Area</b> | Grade 6; English language arts (possibly in conjunction with social studies)                            |
| <b>Duration</b>           | 5 (90-minute) class periods   |
| <b>Proficiency Levels</b> | Ohio English Language Proficiency Standards (Ohio Department of Education, 2015b): Intermediate to High |

*(continued on next page)*

**Lesson Plan** *(continued)*

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Content and Language Objectives</b> | Students will be able to <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• compare and contrast the experiences of reading, listening, and viewing versions of a text. (Content)</li><li>• compare and contrast a text across forms of composition (e.g., a written text, an oral text, and a cartoon). (Content)</li><li>• collaborate with peers using technology to demonstrate understanding of a variety of texts. (Content)</li><li>• interact with peers in small and large group discussions about a variety of texts. (Language)</li><li>• verbally and in written format build upon the thoughts and ideas of peers. (Language)</li><li>• express their ideas in writing and in oral discussions. (Language)</li><li>• verbally and in written form paraphrase texts. (Language)</li><li>• verbally ask questions relevant to discussions or to the texts. (Language)</li><li>• verbally and in written form add relevant information to discussions and to compositions. (Language)</li></ul> |
| <b>Alignment to Standards</b>          | <b>Ohio's Learning Standards</b><br>(Ohio Department of Education, 2017a) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>ELA-Reading Standard for Literature RL.6.7:</i> Compare and contrast the experience of reading a story, drama, or poem to listening to or viewing an audio, video, or live version of the text, including contrasting what they “see” and “hear” when reading the text to what they perceive when they listen or watch.</li><li>• <i>ELA-Reading Standard for Literature RL.6.9:</i> Compare and contrast texts in different forms or genres (e.g., stories and poems; historical novels and fantasy stories) in terms of their approaches to similar themes and topics.</li><li>• <i>ELA-Writing Standard W.6.6:</i> Use technology, including the Internet, to produce and publish writing as well as to interact and collaborate with others, while demonstrating sufficient command of keyboarding skills.</li></ul>  |
| <b>Alignment to Standards</b>          | <b>English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards</b><br>(Ohio Department of Education, 2015b) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>ELP 6-8.2 for Students at Level 4 Proficiency</i><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>— Participate in conversations, discussions, and written exchanges on familiar topics and texts.</li><li>— Build on the ideas of others.</li><li>— Express his or her own ideas.</li><li>— Ask and answer relevant questions.</li></ul></li></ul>   |
| <b>Outcomes</b>                        | Students will <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• display in digital and print mediums the similarities and differences between reading a text, listening to a text, and viewing a text.</li><li>• articulate a reflection about the differing experiences or perceptions experienced in multiple modes of delivery of content.</li></ul>  |

*(continued on next page)*

| <b>Lesson Plan</b> <i>(continued)</i> |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Outcomes</b><br><i>(continued)</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>select and utilize different technological platforms (e.g., PowerPoint, VoiceThread, WeVideo, and Google Docs) in the compositions of expository and comparison responses to the experiences of reading, hearing, and viewing “The Legend of Sleepy Hollow” (Irving, 1863).</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Materials</b>                      | <p>Digital materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A video of <i>The Legend of Sleepy Hollow</i> (e.g., Walt Disney Productions, Geronimi, &amp; Kinney, 1949)</li> <li>Computers, laptops, or tablets (digital devices with recording capability)</li> <li>Headphones</li> <li>Microphone</li> <li>A flex camera</li> <li>An audio recording of “The Legend of Sleepy Hollow” (Irving, 1863)</li> <li>Appendixes A–H (available on the companion website for this book) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“The Legend of Sleepy Hollow”: Reading, Listening, Viewing Plot Diagram/Story Map (Appendix A)</li> <li>Discussion Questions and Answers (Appendix B)</li> <li>Screenshots of Websites Used to Create this Lesson (Appendix C)</li> <li>Vocabulary Activity (Appendix D)</li> <li>Formative Assessment Rubric (Appendix E)</li> <li>Summative Assessment Rubric (Appendix F)</li> <li>“The Legend of Sleepy Hollow”: Reading, Listening, Viewing 2-Mode Venn Diagram (Appendix G)</li> <li>“The Legend of Sleepy Hollow”: Reading, Listening, Viewing 3-Mode Venn Diagram (Appendix H)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Nondigital materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The written story of “The Legend of Sleepy Hollow” (Irving, 1863)</li> <li>Graphic charts (see Appendixes A, G, and H on the companion website for this book, for examples)</li> <li>Picture dictionary</li> <li>Art materials</li> </ul> |

This lesson plan on “The Legend of Sleepy Hollow” (Irving, 1863) was designed to be a component of a unit on writing during the time period before and after the Revolution of the United States in 1776.

## Highlighted Teaching Strategies

As a preteaching strategy, make a digital jumpstart (Rance-Roney, 2010) video about cultural practices, the Colonial context, and necessary semantic knowledge. The video is intended “for pre-reading activities, addressing vocabulary, syntax, reading strategies, and cultural and linguistic schema” (Choi & Yi, 2016, p. 307).

Use digital video production as a preteaching input strategy and as an option for student compositions when they are responding to each of the story presentation modes. This strategy is based on the findings of Miller (2007) in a native-language context and Choi and Yi’s extension of the findings into an L2 context.

## Procedures

### **Prereading/previewing activities: Day 1 (90 minutes)**

Lead the students in prereading, schema-building activities: predicting what will be seen in the written story and what will be heard from the audio story (adapted from Hagood, Provost, Skinner, & Egelson, 2008). Prior to the student collaborative reading of the story, use a flex camera to engage the students in a story walk. Connect contextual clues and vocabulary to words and themes learned previously on the unit of Writings Before and After the Revolution of the United States, with focus on daily life during Colonial America.

Conduct your story walk as students watch and listen. Have them answer questions individually and collaboratively at learning tables.

After the story walk, preteach vocabulary using a teacher-made video of key vocabulary from “The Legend of Sleepy Hollow” (Irving, 1863). The video will convey the words and definitions in word and image form, with provision of context for meaning. The key vocabulary includes the following: *coves*, *indent*, *superstition*, *ingenious*, *onerous*, *ingratiating*, *psalmody*, *pedagogue*, *sputtering*, *haunted*, *supernumerary*, *anecdotes*, and *goblins*.

Have students watch the vocabulary video. At the end of the video, display each word on the screen for 1 minute. During this time, have each group of students work together to come to a consensus on the meaning of the word. Have a representative from each group report to the class their group’s understanding of each vocabulary word.

### **Reading the written story: Day 2 (90 minutes)**

Have students read the story of “The Legend of Sleepy Hollow” (Irving, 1863) in small groups of four at learning tables. During this time, circulate around the room: Sit, listen, and read with each group for at least 5 minutes.

Using a story map (Appendix A, “Reading, Listening, Viewing: Plot Diagram/Story Map”), have students compile the main events in the story while reading and discussing the story together. The story map consists of an introduction (setting, characters), the problem within the narrative up to five main events leading up to the story conclusion, the conclusion, the denouement (or actions that immediately follow the conclusion of the story and slow the pace of the narrative), and the resolution (or what happens to the main characters and/or the setting of the story). Each group of students will complete one story map for the mode of reading.

Have students use a set of discussion questions to guide their understanding of the story; they should work together to find and paraphrase the answers (see Appendix B, “Discussion Questions and Answers”). Circulate between groups to ensure comprehension of main events in the story.

After the groups have been working for 20 minutes on reading, discussing, and completing the story map, show a 3- to 6-minute video of the different response options to the story (e.g., written narrative, PowerPoint, VoiceThread, and WeVideo) and a model of what to include in the response. VoiceThread ([www.voicethread.com](http://www.voicethread.com)) is an online platform that allows users to upload files and then add text, voice-over, and video to the file. WeVideo ([www.wevideo.com](http://www.wevideo.com)), is an online digital video storytelling platform and app. (See Appendix C, “Screenshots of Websites Used to Create this Lesson,” for screenshots and implementation steps for VoiceThread, WeVideo, Kahoot, and Padlet). Possible questions to answer in the response:

- Was it an enjoyable experience?
- What do you think was the main event of the story?
- How did the story make you feel?
- Would you like to read another story by this author?

Have each group of students compose a response to the written story using PowerPoint, VoiceThread, WeVideo, or narrative response, on the experience of reading the story, considering the aforementioned questions.

Each group shares with the class their response to the reading of the story.

### **Listening to the auditory story: Day 3 (90 minutes)**

On the third day of this 5-day lesson plan, demonstrate how to listen to the story using an electronic device. On a desktop or laptop, show the students how to open “The Legend of Sleepy Hollow” (Irving, 1863) in a Google browser, with the Read&Write extension. This app extension allows for the reading aloud, with playback capabilities, of any text opened in a Google browser.

Have the students listen to an audio recording of the story (on a desktop, laptop, or tablet) in groups of four. Circulate around the room to ensure the students do not experience technical challenges.

While listening, students complete a vocabulary assignment focusing on the pre-taught vocabulary words (see Appendix D, “Vocabulary Activity”). Students will also use the story map to compile the main events of the story in small groups.

Each group of students composes a response to the auditory story in the form of a PowerPoint, VoiceThread, WeVideo, or narrative response. Their response should answer the same questions modeled in the response on Day 2. (See Appendix E, “Formative Assessment Rubric.”)

Each group shares with the class their response to listening to the story.

### **Viewing the audio-visual story (video): Day 4 (90 minutes)**

Show the class the 1949 cartoon version of *The Legend of Sleepy Hollow* (Walt Disney Productions, Geronimi, & Kinney). Pause on certain scenes of the video for students to discuss in group what will happen next.

After viewing the video, students illustrate a follow-up story. Give them the option of using art supplies and poster paper or using a comic book creator platform or app (e.g., comic book creator on [readwrite.think.org](http://readwrite.think.org) and [www.powtoon.com](http://www.powtoon.com)). Circulate around the room to observe student understanding.

Have students share their continuation narratives with the class in a gallery walk.

Students reform into groups of four, and each group of students composes a response to the viewing of the story in the form of a PowerPoint, VoiceThread, WeVideo, or narrative response. This response will address the same questions modeled in the response on Day 2.

### **Compare and contrast experiences: Day 5 (45 minutes)**

On the last day of this lesson plan, explain to the students that it is time to compose one final response to the differing experiences of reading, listening, and viewing a narrative.

Have each group of students compose a final summative response (see Appendix F, “Summative Assessment Rubric”) as a PowerPoint, VoiceThread, WeVideo, or narrative response to the experiences of reading, hearing, and seeing “The Legend of Sleepy Hollow” (Irving, 1863). The response should address the following questions:

- How were the experiences of reading, hearing, and seeing similar?
- How were they different?
- Which modality was your favorite?
- Why?
- Your least favorite?
- Why?

### **Closing: Day 5 (45 minutes)**

Lead the students in a five-question Kahoot (a free, game-based learning platform at <https://kahoot.com>) to check comprehension of the story elements. (See the Appendix C for a screenshot of <https://create.kahoot.it> in which a teacher creates a Kahoot; the questions can be amended from the story discussion questions earlier in the lesson.) The students participate in the Kahoot as a large group (if the classroom has one-to-one computing ability) or in the collaborative groups of four (if the classroom has less flexible computing options).

Ask the students, “How does the story change when you read it, listen to it, and then view it?” Direct the students to discuss their responses at their tables.

Model how to use Padlet (<https://padlet.com>; a virtual wall or canvas that allows students to respond to a question using text, images, videos, or links), and record your response to the question there.

Finally, have each student use a digital device to digitally compose their response to your question. Give each student the opportunity to respond; the students may need to take turns, depending on your classroom computer/device options.

### **Extension**

Give groups of students who finish this unit the opportunity to continue the story of “The Legend of Sleepy Hollow” (Irving, 1863) using any medium of communication to present to the class. Encourage students to select the medium of their preference from this experience.

## **Assessment and Evaluation**

There are many opportunities for assessment during this lesson. (See Appendixes E and F for formative and summative assessment rubrics.) You are able to formatively assess the students throughout this lesson:

- Observe the discussion of the story questions and the completion of the story map while circulating. (Day 2)
- Assess each group’s response to the reading/listening of the story while groups share their responses with the class. (Days 2 and 3)
- Observe the discussion and completion of the vocabulary activity and listening story map. (Day 3)
- Assess student understanding of the content, directions, and technology as they create their follow-up story. (Day 4)

Possible items for assessment include

- the three story maps (reading the story, hearing the story, and watching the story),
- the Padlet responses,
- the reflection compositions after each stage of the lesson (reading, listening, and viewing),
- the Kahoot responses, and
- the vocabulary activity.

You also have the opportunity to summatively assess the students’ comparison composition on the experiences of reading, listening to, and viewing a narrative. These responses could be in the form of a narrative response, WeVideo, VoiceThread, Venn diagram (see Appendixes G, “Reading, Listening, Viewing: 2-Mode Venn Diagram,”

and H, “Reading, Listening, Viewing: 3-Mode Venn Diagram,” for worksheets), or other approved format detailing the similarities and differences of the experiences and perceptions of reading, hearing, and then seeing the focal text.

## Reflection on and Analysis of the Lesson

The words of the Ohio English Language Proficiency Standards (Ohio Department of Education, 2015b) are particularly salient to practice, research, and policy regarding multimodal literacy. This lesson plan purposefully utilized multimodal literacy practices for ELs to “participate in conversations, build on the ideas of others, and express [their] own ideas” (p. 32). By scaffolding student learning experiences across all modes of design in both consumption and production of ideas, ELs will experience an active learning, speaking, writing, and thinking environment. Although this particular lesson plan has not yet been implemented in this context, our previous experience as elementary and middle school teachers using digital multimodal literacy practices makes us enthusiastic about the possibility of implementing this lesson. In our classroom experiences with ELs and digital and multimodal literacy practices, students have expressed excitement and engagement throughout digital and multimodal lesson plans. In general, students particularly enjoy creating collaborative VoiceThread and WeVideo compositions to showcase their learning. However, beyond the process of composition, students also benefit from the opportunity to share their learning (and teaching) with their peers, and the experience of composing for an audience increases the quality of student products.

Contemplation on the anchor article (Choi & Yi, 2016) results in important insights toward our pedagogy moving forward. The article showcased the reflective process of Jude and Savanna as they grew in their confidence of the affordances possible through multimodality. Similar to Jude and Savanna, the constraints we “felt with time and skills with technological tools faded away as [we] continued to use multimodality in [our] practice” (p. 322). Thus, perhaps one of the greatest impediments toward the use of multimodal literacy practices in classrooms may be practitioners’ willingness to attempt implementation. Similar to Choi and Yi and to Rance-Roney (2010), we anticipate that with continual, thoughtful implementation of multimodality, the ease with which practitioners are able to connect content learning standards for ELA and English language proficiency standards to activities mediated by multimodality will grow immensely over time. Thus, willingness for practitioners to creatively and thoughtfully investigate multimodality in learning activities connected to learning standards is a key factor in the access ELs will have to multimodal literacy practices. These practices ultimately leverage students’ communicative ability, engender confidence, and connect to the home literacy practices students utilize with increasing frequency and fluency.

Just as practitioners will need to reconceptualize their learning and teaching practices to harness the potentialities of multimodal literacy practices for ELs, there are also important implications for researchers and policymakers. One practitioner concern that will need to be addressed in research and policy is the role of multimodal literacy practices in the context of accountability and high-stakes testing that principally focuses on the reading and writing of print-based texts (Choi & Yi, 2016; Pandya, 2012). In this chapter, we provided examples of possible formative and summative assessments for the classroom setting. However, the legitimacy and the impact of classroom-based assessments using rubrics or performance-based assessments of skills will need to be further explored in the context of research with the purpose of impacting educational policy and standards. Given that composition of multimodal texts allows students to develop greater

depth of understanding and engagement in both the content and the process of learning (Jacobs, 2012), perhaps as researchers and practitioners continue to explore the purposes and possibilities of multimodal literacy practices in classroom settings, the gatekeepers of educational policy and standards will develop the realization of the role and importance of these practices.

*Nicole King is a doctoral student at The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, USA.*

*Afida Safriani is a doctoral student at The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, USA.*

*Youngjoo Yi is an associate professor at The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, USA.*

## References

- Ajayi, L. (2008). Meaning-making, multimodal representation, and transformative pedagogy: An exploration of meaning construction instructional practices in an ESL high school classroom. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 7, 206–229. doi:10.1080/25348450802237822
- Beach, R., Thein, A. H., & Webb, A. (2015). *Teaching to exceed the English Language Arts Common Core State Standards: A critical inquiry approach for 6-12 classrooms* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Choi, J., & Yi, Y. (2016). Teachers' integration of multimodality into classroom practices for English language learners. *TESOL Journal*, 7, 304–327. doi:10.1002/tesj.204
- Danzak, R. (2011). Defining identities through multiliteracies: EL teens narrate their immigration experiences as graphic stories. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 55(3), 187–196.
- Early, M., Kendrick, M., & Potts, D. (2015). Multimodality: Out from the margins of English language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 49, 447–460. doi:10.1002/tesq.246
- Early, M., & Marshall, S. (2008). Adolescent ESL students' interpretation and appreciation of literary texts: A case study of multimodality. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 64, 377–397. doi:10.3138/cmlr.64.3.377
- Hagood, M. C., Provost, M., Skinner, E., & Egelson, P. (2008). Teachers' and students' literacy performance in and engagement with new literacies strategies in underperforming middle schools. *Middle Grades Research Journal*, 3, 57–95.
- Irving, W. (1863). The legend of Sleepy Hollow. Retrieved from [http://www.ibiblio.org/ebooks/Irving/Sleepy/Irving\\_Sleepy.pdf](http://www.ibiblio.org/ebooks/Irving/Sleepy/Irving_Sleepy.pdf)
- Jacobs, G. E. (2012). The proverbial rock and hard place: The realities and risks of teaching in a world of multiliteracies, participatory culture, and mandates. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 56, 98–102. doi:10.1002/JAAL.00109
- Miller, S. M. (2007). English teacher learning for new times: Digital video composing as multimodal literacy practice. *English Education*, 40(1), 64–83.
- Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & González, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and schools. *Theory into Practice*, 31(2), 132–141.
- National Council of Teachers of English. (2005). Position statement on multimodal literacies. Retrieved from <http://www.ncte.org/positions/statements/multimodalliteracies>
- Ohio Department of Education. (2015a). English language arts curriculum model grade six. Retrieved from [https://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Ohio-s-New-Learning-Standards/English/Grade\\_6\\_ELA\\_Model\\_Curriculum\\_March-2015.pdf.aspx](https://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Ohio-s-New-Learning-Standards/English/Grade_6_ELA_Model_Curriculum_March-2015.pdf.aspx)
- Ohio Department of Education. (2015b). English language proficiency standards. Retrieved from [http://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Other-Resources/Limited-English-Proficiency/ELL-Guidelines/Ohio-English-Language-Proficiency-ELP-Standards/150817\\_ODE\\_ELA\\_ProficiencyStandards\\_6-8.pdf.aspx](http://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Other-Resources/Limited-English-Proficiency/ELL-Guidelines/Ohio-English-Language-Proficiency-ELP-Standards/150817_ODE_ELA_ProficiencyStandards_6-8.pdf.aspx)

- Ohio Department of Education. (2017a). Ohio's learning standards: English language arts. Retrieved from <http://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Learning-in-Ohio/English-Language-Art/English-Language-Arts-Standards/ELA-Learning-Standards-2017.pdf.aspx>
- Ohio Department of Education. (2017b). Ohio's learning standards for English language arts & literacy in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects appendix B: Text exemplars and sample performance tasks. Retrieved from [http://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Learning-in-Ohio/English-Language-Art/English-Language-Arts-Standards/Appendix\\_B.pdf.aspx](http://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Learning-in-Ohio/English-Language-Art/English-Language-Arts-Standards/Appendix_B.pdf.aspx)
- Pandya, J. Z. (2012). Unpacking Pandora's box: Issues in the assessment of English learners' literacy skill development in multimodal classrooms. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 56(3), 181–185. doi:10.1002/JAAL.00124
- Rance-Roney, J. (2010). Jump-starting language and schema for English-language learners: Teacher-composed digital jumpstarts for academic reading. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 53, 386–395. doi:10.1598/JAAL.53.5.4
- Skinner, E., & Hagood, M. (2008). Developing literate identities with English language learners through digital storytelling. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, 8(2), 12–38.
- Walt Disney Productions (Producer), Geronimi, C. (Director), & Kinney, J. (Director). (1949). *The Legend of Sleepy Hollow*. USA: Walt Disney Productions.
- Yi, Y., & Choi, J. (2015). Teachers' views of multimodal practices in K–12 classrooms: Voices from teachers in the United States. *TESOL Quarterly*, 49, 838–847. doi:10.1002/tesq.219

## Additional Resources

- Longfellow, H. W., & Bing, C. H. (2001). *The midnight ride of Paul Revere*. Brooklyn, NY: Handprint Books.
- Miller, A. (1976). *The crucible: A play in four acts*. New York, NY: Penguin.
- U.S. Constitution. pmb.