

Pedagogical Principles as the Basis for Multiliteracy Assessment in Literature Learning in Higher Education

Qurrota Ayu Neina*

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Semarang, Indonesia

Agus Nuryatin

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Semarang, Indonesia

RM. Teguh Supriyanto

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Semarang, Indonesia

Hari Bakti Mardikantoro

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Semarang, Indonesia

U'um Qomariyah

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Semarang, Indonesia

Muhammad Burhanudin

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Semarang, Indonesia

Abstract—The two main topics covered in this paper are the pedagogical principles of multiliteracy as the cornerstone of successful assessment and the ideal forms of literariness in higher education teaching and learning. Evaluating multiliteracy is essential for showing that students have understood the material and proving that they can interact with many genres at the same degree of complexity. These evaluations are also essential for informing decisions about education and curriculum development. Assessments' design must incorporate practical educational concepts to convert theoretical frameworks into proper instruments that guarantee relevance, fairness, and accuracy. Assessments can create a learning environment that supports the development of critical professional skills by upholding solid pedagogical ideas. This study follows Borg and Gall's research and development (R&D) approach, concentrating on the first two phases, Phase 1 (information collection and research) and Phase 2 (planning). It uses needs analysis and research data to direct the evaluation procedure. The results highlight the need to include practical pedagogical components, such as explicit knowledge transformation, real-world practice contexts, and reflective learning, in assessing multiliteracy in literary education. With a heavy emphasis on literary literacy, these guidelines guarantee that evaluations in literary education test critical thinking, creativity, and the capacity to comprehend and produce various types of literacy in addition to content knowledge.

Index Terms—pedagogical principles, higher education, literacy, multiliteracy assessment, literature learning

I. INTRODUCTION

Today, literacy encompasses more than just the ability to read and write. Beyond traditional literacy, the capacity to understand, interpret, and communicate ideas in various formats or media has become a crucial component of education. In this sense, the multiliteracy approach is essential for assisting students in developing their analytical skills and ability to navigate a complicated world.

Multiliteracy is essential for students to comprehend literary texts and their relationships to diverse cultural, social, and technical contexts in the framework of literature studies in higher education. Activities related to evaluation cannot be divorced from the learning process. A well-designed examination can spark students' enthusiasm for learning, allowing them to reach their maximum potential and produce the best results. According to Badjeber et al. (2018) and Neina and Wagiran (2023), evaluation is crucial to learning. It is necessary to determine the success and accomplishment of learning objectives. A proper evaluation procedure may also develop students' critical and creative thinking, preparing them to take on global challenges and develop into competent, exceptional people.

* Corresponding Author.

The foundation of today's educational procedures must be assessed if better human resources are to be developed. According to Lo and Leung (2022), evaluation is essential to good teaching and learning because it offers feedback that guides learning objectives and proves student accomplishment. In Indonesia, the education paradigm has changed, affecting how assessments are conducted. Assessments used to be mainly concerned with learning outcomes. According to Tan (2018), educational assessments put students at the center of the learning process in Generation 4.0. According to Iman et al. (2021), the previous evaluation paradigm frequently ignored the entire learning process in favor of merely satisfying basic norms. As a result, teachers may become the primary authority in teaching and learning, diminishing students' roles in the process (Abidin, 2015; Elihami, 2019; Nuryani et al., 2019). This problem emphasizes how education's assessment system needs to be reoriented to serve the needs of academics, society, and the workforce better.

Accordingly, multiliteracy evaluation is crucial for gauging students' proficiency with academic material and their capacity to use it wisely in various contexts and media (Buckley-Walker et al., 2017; Savva, 2019). These tests also evaluate critical thinking, analysis, problem-solving, and effective communication (Botelho et al., 2014; Dawson, 2020). This is highly pertinent in literary studies, which seek to advance holistic development.

Since they offer a framework that guarantees assessments are impartial, accurate, and pertinent, sound pedagogical principles are essential to creating a successful assessment. The goal of assessments created with proper educational concepts is to cultivate abilities that students may use in their personal and professional lives (Ellaway, 2019; Kim Anh, 2024; Pellegrino, 2018; Wilson & Tan, 2023). These guidelines ensure that examinations can adapt to different learning preferences and skill levels, giving every student an equal chance to reach their full potential. Students need this kind of training to overcome obstacles in their personal and professional lives.

Furthermore, evaluations that allow students to apply their information in a variety of circumstances as well as assess what they have learned are made possible by pedagogical principles (Khamidullaevna, 2022; T M & Gupta, 2022). Effective teaching guarantees that multiliteracy tests accommodate many modes of cognition and learning, giving each student an equal chance to exhibit various skills (Andreev & Usova, 2019; LaVelle et al., 2020). These guidelines also help teachers create tests that encourage in-depth, relevant learning and get pupils ready for problems they may face in the real world. Thus, developing a comprehensive, student-centered learning environment requires incorporating pedagogical ideas into multiliteracy assessments.

This article discusses pedagogical ideas that serve as the foundation for multiliteracy assessment in higher-level literary learning. As a result, the problem in this paper is conceptualized as follows.

1. How do pedagogical principles appear when evaluating multiliteracy in literary learning in higher education?
2. In the context of literary learning in higher education, what are the obstacles to incorporating pedagogical concepts into multiliteracy assessment, and what are the most effective ways to get beyond them?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. *Pedagogical Foundations for Multiliteracy Evaluation*

Pedagogical principles are fundamental criteria that guarantee the efficacy, significance, and customization of the assessment process to suit the needs of students (Garayev, 2023; Romiaty et al., 2024). These tenets aim to promote students' intellectual, social, and emotional development by supporting their development.

Research has shown that essential factors must be considered when creating instructional concepts. To make evaluations more relevant and exciting, these principles must prioritize each student's unique requirements, interests, and learning preferences (Froldova et al., 2017; Pérez Cavana, 2012; Simonova & Poulouva, 2014). According to Crean and Prunty (2011) and Dolin et al. (2018), they should also support students in building knowledge through reflection, experiential learning, and interactions with peers and the surrounding environment. Thirdly, tests ought to be tied to real-world situations so that students can see how the knowledge they have gained can be put to use (Minavvarovna et al., 2022; T M & Gupta, 2022). Fourthly, critical thinking should be encouraged, enabling students to assess, evaluate, and synthesize knowledge while encouraging originality and creativity (Khamidullaevna, 2022; Nasya Putri Nabila et al., 2024). Finally, students should be encouraged to reflect on their learning to improve their understanding and outcomes (Davies, 1997; Nazim qızı Talışmski, 2022).

The pedagogical principles discussed in the article here apply to the rules that are followed when creating and implementing assessments. These tests measure students' proficiency with the subject matter (product) and the many modes and forms of interpretation, analysis, and expression of meaning (process). These ideas are rooted in educational approaches that foster critical thinking, teamwork, creativity, and adaptability—skills crucial in the modern, digitally connected world. These pedagogical concepts provide ecological, fair, and authentic student assessments in multiliteracy assessment, which align with contemporary educational requirements.

B. *Assessment of Multiliteracy in Literature Learning in Higher Education*

According to Nitko (1989), assessment is obtaining data to make decisions concerning students, programs, curricula, and institutions. The three primary parts of this definition are the formal endeavor, the student status, and the educational variables of interest. An intentional and methodical attempt is referred to as a formal endeavor. Student status refers to their abilities, knowledge, and attitudes, whereas educational variables of interest deal with other facets of education.

According to Abidin (2015), multiliteracy entails using various techniques to convey and comprehend concepts and information using traditional and novel media, including texts, symbols, and multimedia. To elaborate, Bahtiar and Nasrullah (2019) define multiliteracy as the capacity in various media. The ability to interact with many languages, media, and communication formats—such as text, images, sounds, and videos—is included in it (Karkar Esperat, 2024; Seglem & Garcia, 2022).

Holdren (2012) suggests that criteria emphasize processes and products in the assessment context, incorporate new activities with explicit instructions for interpreting criteria, and encourage communication between assessors and students. In order to support the multiliteracy agenda and change educational practices, multiliteracy assessments seek to test students' competencies and comprehension more extensively and accurately. According to Anderson (2013), Nash (2018), and Zammit (2018), formative practices and flexible criteria are encouraged in multiliteracy assessments, which in turn promote cross-modal meaning-making. In their work, Anderson and Kachorsky (2019) reframe multiliteracy assessment as a multimodal composition paradigm, emphasizing essential distinctions and providing recommendations for updating higher education's instructional strategies. This article presents a multiliteracy assessment strategy that offers suggestions for improving assessment procedures in literary education, encouraging a multiliteracy approach to learning, and accurately assessing students' comprehension and competencies.

III. METHOD

A. *Research Design*

Utilizing research and development (R&D) protocols as described by Gall et al. (1983), modified to meet the objectives and circumstances of the present investigation, this study takes a qualitative approach. The study focuses on the first two stages of research and development, or (a) planning and information collection and (b) research. These actions result in the following outcomes: 1) doing a requirements analysis as part of an initial study to find pedagogical components for applying multiliteracy assessments based on literary learning in higher education. 2) defining pedagogical guidelines for multiliteracy evaluation and pointing out the difficulties in applying these guidelines to the assessment of literary learning in higher education.

B. *Information & Data Sources*

Data from the assessment instruments used in literature courses at five Indonesian universities were used to 1) identify pedagogical components in applying multiliteracy assessments, which were then used to design the pedagogical principles for multiliteracy assessment in higher education. 2) The findings of an analysis, based on interviews with five professors who teach prose at Indonesian universities, on the difficulties encountered in incorporating pedagogical concepts into multiliteracy assessments in the literature study. Purposive sampling techniques were employed to choose the participants.

IV. RESULT

A. *Educational Foundations for Multiliteracy Evaluation of Literature Instruction in Postsecondary Education*

1. An explanation of the needs analysis's findings

According to Bloom's taxonomy and its later updates, multiliteracy skills are organized around eight core abilities, which the conceptual model supports. These skills include locating, comprehending, applying, assessing, evaluating, synthesizing, producing, and communicating (Anderson & Kachorsky, 2019; Bloom, 1956; Churches, 2009; Turcsanyi-Szabo, 2012).

Furthermore, as Kalantzis et al. (2003) point out, multiliteracy pedagogy aims to introduce students to various texts without alienating them. As a result, pedagogical principles supporting more precise evaluation models are necessary, especially in literary education. In this setting, process-based literary learning is evaluated using four primary components of multiliteracy pedagogy: critical frames, explicit learning, practical circumstances, and critical transformations (Cope & Kalantzis, 2005). Although these elements offer a comprehensive framework, they must be divided into more focused instructional concepts to simplify the evaluation process.

A requirements analysis to determine pedagogical components in implementing multiliteracy assessments in literary education at higher education institutions was part of the preliminary study that was carried out to create these principles. The investigation concentrated on the evaluation instruments utilized in literature classes at five Indonesian institutions. Purposive sampling was used to choose these colleges based on the learning objectives of the literature programs.

To ascertain if the pertinent principles had been applied, pedagogical indicators were used to study each assessment instrument from the five universities. After that, essential indicators were mapped out to direct the creation of the necessary educational concepts. Below is a summary of the findings from this preliminary investigation into using pedagogical principles.

Sixty percent of the evaluation tools did not include practical scenarios in literary assessment, according to the examination of the tools. This represents a 40% implementation of the first indicator. Pre-learning evaluation, the first component, aids in establishing a learner's fundamental comprehension of the subject matter. It is essential because it establishes the foundation for the learner's self-identification and offers insights into their sociocultural background.

Fostering insight and profound comprehension through the learning process is the subject of the second indicator. According to the analysis, a reflection-based learning model demonstrated that every gadget (100%) complies with this component. This indication is connected to tests given to students to gauge their understanding of the subject matter. The third indicator is a vital frame that students can utilize to work creatively while honing fundamental skills. Based on the investigation, four devices (80%) lack a vital frame element, whereas one device (20%) already possesses one. This third element has to do with evaluating literary appreciation through fundamental research. This dimension is desperately needed as a catalyst to create a shift in viewpoint that will ultimately lead to a change in attitude to be more positive.

Just 20% of the tools include the third criterion, which focuses on creating important frameworks that enable students to work creatively and build necessary skills; the remaining 80% do not. The critical frame ignites shifts in viewpoint and attitudes toward more favorable outcomes, vital for literary enjoyment and fundamental inquiry. Performative activities demonstrate learning for the fourth indicator, transformative practice. The analysis shows that whereas 80% of the tools have not satisfied this indicator, 20% of them have. This part evaluates literary expression and creativity via oral or written performance.

To summarise, examining these four indicators reveals that most evaluation instruments still fail to meet the requirements of multiliteracy pedagogy. This is a starting point for formulating policies for creating and executing tests that gauge students' understanding of the material and their capacity to comprehend, interpret, and convey meaning in various media and formats. These rules, also known as pedagogical principles, emphasize good attitudes, creativity, critical thinking, independence, invention, and knowledge acquisition.

2. Pedagogical Principles of Literature Learning in Higher Education: Multiliteracy Assessment

The outcomes of the needs analysis of the completed learning tools and the pedagogical components of multiliteracy, which serve as the foundation for assessments in literary education, form the two fundamental principles underlying this study's pedagogical framework for multiliteracy assessment in higher education literature learning. The alignment of data from these two sources is then outlined in detail by the pedagogical principles guiding multiliteracy assessments. These principles are subsequently translated into technical specifications, serving as guidelines for a multiliteracy-based assessment system in higher education literary learning. Key concepts among these guiding principles include critical transformation, essential frameworks, explicit learning, and practical situations.

a. Critical Situation Principle

The success indicators for applying practical situational principles in prose learning aim to develop an understanding of the socio-cultural context and provide a structured learning sequence vital for the formation of self-identity (Al-Hafizh, 2010; Sholehudin et al., 2019; Wang, 2021). Pre-learning assessments are linked to this principle to gauge students' foundational knowledge of the material (Kaufman, 1978; Landry, 2016). Table 1 outlines this essential element.

TABLE 1
CRITICAL SITUATION PRINCIPLES IN MULTILITERACY ASSESSMENT

Subaspects	Principle	Norm
Critical situation	Knowledge of the sociocultural context	The evaluation can gauge how well students can recognize, clarify, and connect sociocultural components of the literary work under study to their experiences or background knowledge.
		The evaluation gauged the students' comprehension of how sociocultural variations impact how literary works are seen and interpreted.
	Participating actively in exams before learning	The evaluation process measured the students' proficiency in pre-learning exercises to investigate their comprehension of the socio-cultural background of literary works.
	Ability to relate one's identity to literary works	The exam can gauge how well pupils can relate significant sociocultural concerns to intrinsic and extrinsic literary aspects.
		Evaluations show pupils can reflect and create literary works relevant to their experiences or worldviews.
	Building capacity through pivotal circumstances	The assessment can determine how well students use their understanding of socioculture to analyze literary works critically and question the attitudes, assumptions, and points of view they put forward.
		In the evaluation, students' opinions were developed and bolstered by proof drawn from literary works and personal experiences, indicating that they had comprehended the subject. It might also, nevertheless, apply the information in a more general sense.
	Increasing motivation and learning enthusiasm	The evaluation can potentially increase students' enthusiasm and drive to read prose pieces connected to sociocultural settings that apply to their daily lives.
The evaluation demonstrates a passion for experiential learning activities, like project-based assignments or talks that relate literature to cultural contexts.		

b. Clear Learning Principles

The objective of the multiliteracy evaluation process's success indicators for putting explicit learning principles into practice is to develop profound knowledge and understanding (Gijbels et al., 2005; Sahni, 2018; Thaba-Nkadimene & Molotja, 2021). This part of the learning process is connected to formative evaluation, which offers input on how well students have understood the material (Botezatu, 2023; I Dewa Ayu Made Meilani Pramesti, 2024). Table 2 lists the components of transparent learning.

TABLE 2
UNAMBIGUOUS LEARNING CONCEPTS FOR MULTILITERACY EVALUATION

Subaspects	Principle	Norm
Clear learning	Objectives for learning are clear.	The assessment can be used to describe the multiliteracy assessment procedure and define and clarify the learning objectives.
		The evaluation demonstrates how the specified activity or task and the learning objectives are in sync.
	enhanced comprehension of concepts	The formative assessment findings demonstrated that students had a deeper comprehension of the key ideas covered in class based on their responses to questions, completion of assignments, and participation in discussions.
		The evaluation procedure demonstrates that students have comprehensive memorization and comprehension of the subject matter by having them explain the ideas they have learned in their own words.
	Participating actively in the educational process	The evaluation demonstrates students' engagement in activities meant to strengthen their understanding, like group discussions, exercises, or projects centered around multiliteracy.
		Participation of students in Q&A sessions or debates might be enhanced by the assessment conducted.
	Utilizing criticism to make improvements	Through formative assessments, the assessment process offers feedback to fix mistakes, raise the caliber of assignments, and increase student comprehension.
		The comments motivate students to revise and improve their assignments, illustrating a continuous and reflective learning process.
	Capacity to incorporate data	Depending on the evaluation method, data from various media or sources might be combined to create a more thorough picture.
		The assessment demonstrates that the student can connect previously learned concepts to new ones. It demonstrates how education exposes kids to knowledge and the outside world.
	Alignment between assessment findings and instructional objectives	Formative and summative assessment scores show that students have attained the required understanding since they align with the established learning objectives.
		The established criteria and learning objectives are in agreement.
Critical and reflective thinking abilities are growing.	Through assessment tasks, including text analysis, argument evaluation, and creative solution development, the assessment findings demonstrate critical and reflective thinking skills.	
	Formative evaluation signifies deeper processing and highlights the need for a learning environment where students may find, comprehend, apply, analyze, evaluate, synthesize, and generate the knowledge they have learned.	
favorable reaction to the process of learning	Pupils give affirmative answers, demonstrating that studying improves their comprehension of the subject.	
	Students exhibit greater confidence when taking examinations because they are more prepared and aware of the learning objectives.	

c. Critical Frame Principle

Students are encouraged to actively participate in their learning by building skills using success indicators for implementing the critical framing principle in the multiliteracy assessment process (Hendriani et al., 2021; Misaa et al.,

2022; Thaba-Nkadimene & Molotja, 2021). This component emphasizes the importance of critical evaluation in literary appreciation through inquiry (Draditaswari, 2024; Pieper, 2020). Table 3 provides a detailed summary of this essential aspect.

TABLE 3
CRITICAL FRAMING PRINCIPLES FOR MULTILITERACY ASSESSMENT

Subaspects	Principle	Norm
Critical frame	the capacity to recognize and assess assumptions in the text	This assessment illustrates how well students can distinguish between the character, subject, or performer in examining the literary work under consideration and the presumptions praised in the outline.
		This evaluation is an excellent illustration of how researchers can legitimately challenge preconceived notions, weigh their merits, and investigate them to the extent necessary to comprehend a literary work after it has been used.
Critical and comprehensive formulation of questions		The exams faithfully reflect crucial questions that reflect a deep understanding of this work and potential ones if they have anything to do with the text and its historical, social, and cultural background.
		The evaluation also increased discussion and involvement with the major topics and concerns of the work.
robust and dependable argumentation abilities		Students may be inspired by the evaluation to create well-organized and persuasive arguments backed up by textual evidence and pertinent outside sources, considering a range of viewpoints.
inventiveness in crafting original interpretations		The evaluation can provide fresh perspectives on literary works and demonstrate students' inventiveness in assembling original or novel interpretations backed by in-depth critical examination.
Capacity to connect the text to current social issues		The evaluation can offer insight into contemporary issues by connecting the text's themes and ideas to pertinent social, cultural, or political issues.
enhancing critical thinking skills via the investigation method		Assessments can demonstrate how students' critical skills have developed, particularly their capacity to consider, analyze, and assess the literary works they have studied.
Using critical frames in talks and presentations		Specific evaluations effectively employ critical framing in talks or presentations, exhibiting a thorough comprehension and the capacity to convey student thought.
Capacity to connect the text to current social issues		The evaluation can offer insight into contemporary issues by connecting the text's themes and ideas to pertinent social, cultural, or political issues.
enhancing critical thinking skills via the investigation method		Assessments can demonstrate how students' critical skills have developed, particularly their capacity to consider, analyze, and assess the literary works they have studied.
Using critical frames in talks and presentations		Specific evaluations effectively employ critical framing in talks or presentations, exhibiting a thorough comprehension and the capacity to convey student thought.
Capacity to consider the process of learning		Students are encouraged to reflect on their learning experience during the evaluation, which includes using critical frames to get a deeper understanding and appreciation of literary texts.
Evaluation findings indicating vital capability development		The quality of the students' analysis, arguments, text interpretations, and evaluation results demonstrate that the students have significantly enhanced their critical thinking skills.
		In doing so, the evaluation makes the case that by reacting critically and creatively, students can provide a variety of fresh critical understandings or inventive answers to problems in literary texts.

d. Critical Transformation Principles

Performative tasks are used in multiliteracy evaluation to demonstrate how transformative practice concepts have been applied (Cooper et al., 2013; Patterson et al., 2015). Literary originality and expression, both written and spoken, are evaluated in this component (Layoc, 2024; Rosado et al., 2022).

TABLE 4
CRITICAL TRANSFORMATION PRINCIPLES FOR MULTILITERACY ASSESSMENT

Subaspects	Principle	Norm
Critical transformation	hone your thoughtful and critical thinking abilities when writing	Utilize the assessment process to practice creative growth. Students are urged to develop fresh concepts, experiment with various styles and methods, and produce increasingly complex work in response to criticism.
	Oral expression is characterized by inventiveness and inventiveness	In addition to teaching students how to elicit fresh interpretations or distinctive delivery styles and rhetorical and performative notions, the evaluation requires students to creatively and innovatively deliver some oral presentation of literary works (poetry reading, monologue, or presentation).
	The capacity to connect one's own experiences with literary works	The evaluation enables the management and treatment of individual experiences related to reading and producing works with intricate political undertones to be made public.
	Learning objectives are met through performative assignments.	Student achievement of the learning objectives, including critical thinking abilities, creativity, and a thorough comprehension of literary works, is demonstrated via the evaluation procedure.
	Literary works' social and contextual relevance	These assessments may challenge the students to show their work to bring about social change and comprehend the urgent need for excellent literature beyond academic essays' scope.
	The process of learning through creative evolution	Creative evolution: Students will continuously explore ideas and experiment with styles and techniques to incorporate feedback and generate more complex work during evaluation.

B. Difficulties and Approaches in Using Multiliteracy Assessment in Literature Instruction in Higher Education

Various multiliteracy assessments are still challenging to include in instructional materials, particularly for advanced learners. These challenges stem from how we now teach and interpret texts and the complex and ever-changing nature of literacy in today's digitally connected, globalized society. Mensonides et al. (2024) define literacy in the digital age as having the ability to read and write well on various platforms, such as social media, digital, and visual media. Assessing these multiliteracies becomes more complicated when one considers the varying degrees of access to and usage of technology across students (Brown et al., 2010; Walsh, 2017).

Addressing the varied student backgrounds and skills required to acquire various forms of literacy outside of the digital realm, such as visual and cultural literacy—essential elements of multiliteracies, as examined by multiple researchers (de Andrade Pereira, 2001; Karkar Esperat, 2024)—is a major overarching challenge. It can be challenging for students to incorporate these literacies into interpreting and articulating literary texts (Erniwati et al., 2023; Saxena, 2018; Yavuz, 2014). On the other hand, teachers are responsible for creating robust and all-encompassing evaluation models that test students' critical thinking, creativity, and invention in addition to their content knowledge (Chan-Anteza, 2020; Sofyan et al., 2024).

In order to tackle these problems, we suggest implementing a more student-centered methodology that permits the investigation of many modes of expression in theory and practice (Chaudhary, 2024; Nikoladze, 2023; Tang, 2023). Teachers can use practice theory to facilitate reflective and interactive learning. They can also support metacognition by providing feedback that helps students develop their ideas within multiliteracy objectives. In order to enhance learning and assessment, the curriculum should also incorporate digital technology and online platforms. This will allow students to collaborate across disciplines and access more resources and professional development opportunities. These techniques can help multiliteracy assessments be used in higher education in a diverse learning environment in a way that is more inclusive, flexible, and adaptable (Carraro, 2023; Johnstone et al., 2022; Tai, 2023).

Putting many practical concepts into practice can improve learning quality and assessments, while the challenges of developing multiliteracy tests can be reduced. These tactics, which include using digital technology, offering a variety of extra resources, and emphasizing student-centered learning, enable students to acquire various forms of literacy pertinent to the demands of the modern world. Therefore, learning becomes more flexible and inclusive, and variances in students' backgrounds and skill levels can be considered. Because of this, students learn the subject matter and develop critical, imaginative, and creative thinking abilities that are useful in their personal and professional lives. The learning and assessment process in the university setting will become more comprehensive, pertinent, and meaningful if these tactics are applied consistently.

V. DISCUSSION

A. The Need to Use Constructivist Pedagogy to Integrate Multiliteracy Assessment Immediately

The main goal of constructivist pedagogy is to have students actively involved in creating knowledge through their interactions with classmates, texts, and media. Because it is student-centered and enables them to deepen their

understanding through practical experiences, discussion, and reflection, this approach is essential for developing knowledge (Laskar & Bhattacharjee, 2022). By engaging with various texts, media, and classmates, learners can link new concepts to their previous experiences and knowledge, which leads to a more profound and meaningful grasp of the subject. Additionally, this pedagogy promotes autonomy, encouraging students to take control of their learning journey, investigate different resources, and engage in questioning and self-evaluation (Arasit, 2023; Mishra, 2023; Ranjana, 2022). This process equips them to handle future changes and challenges.

When applied to the multiliteracy assessment model in literary education, these constructivist principles underscore engaging with various text formats and media, such as digital, visual, and cultural materials. Interacting with these diverse literacies enhances students' understanding of literary works, allowing them to view and interpret them through multiple perspectives. As a result, assessments should evaluate students' understanding of content and their ability to engage with and integrate different forms of literacy, capturing the complexity of modern communication.

B. Reflective Assessment and Student-Centered Learning

Realistic multiliteracy practice requires a student-centered approach that puts the student's needs, experiences, and growth first in the learning process (Chaudhary, 2024; Radzitskaya & Tasbulatova, 2024). This method promotes continual, reflexive, formative assessments so students can evaluate themselves as they grow, much like when teachers give them feedback on their work.

Assessment, much like teaching, requires creativity and imagination. Literary learning should consider both the outcomes and the processes, considering whether students develop the ability to think critically or creatively, and should adapt to various literacy contexts. This approach encourages students to explore their potential for understanding fully and expressing ideas in any literary work. The argument is that engaging students dialogically in interpreting texts and media should be promoted in multiliteracy assessments to foster critical and creative thinking.

Through exploring various perspectives on the same subject, literary perspectivism helps students develop their approach to literature and fortify their analytical abilities. It also encourages the use of cutting-edge concepts in literacy and literature. Writing, public speaking, multimedia presentations, and participation in class discussions are just a few of the ways that students can express themselves through a student-centered multiliteracy evaluation (Fernández-Costales, 2023; Jacobs, 2013; Karkar Esperat, 2024; Thibaut & Curwood, 2018). As a result, exams become more inclusive and exciting by allowing students to demonstrate their knowledge and abilities in ways that suit their preferences and strong points.

VI. CONCLUSION

Infusing new matriculation techniques, infusing practicality into English dialogue learning, arranging fragmented activities with complicated language, and supporting holistic transformation are all part of the pedagogical concepts for assessing multiliteracy in literature study. When taken as a whole, these guidelines guarantee that the assessment procedure assesses students' comprehension of the subject matter while promoting critical thinking, creativity, and the capacity to interact with diverse literacies in literary contexts.

While there are benefits to using the multiliteracy assessment technique, there are also drawbacks. These include staff resistance to change, a lack of resources, and the requirement to modify procedures for various learning styles. Innovative approaches are needed to address these issues, such as moving toward student-centered learning, applying contemporary educational technologies, and incorporating different literacies into the framework for learning and assessment to better handle the intricacies of multiliteracy evaluation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Agency funded this study for the Indonesia Endowment Fund for Education (LPDP) and the Assessment and Application of Technology (BPPT). We appreciate their resources and financial assistance, which allowed this study to be conducted.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abidin, Y. (2015). *Pembelajaran Multiliterasi: Sebuah Jawaban Atas Tantangan Abad 21 dalam Konteks Keindonesiaan* [Multiliteracy Learning: An Answer to the Challenges of the 21st Century in the Indonesian Context]. Refika Aditama.
- [2] Al-Hafizh, M. (2010). The praise of prose in achieving participatory English language teaching (ELT). *Lingua Didaktika: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Pembelajaran Bahasa*, 4(1), 35. <https://doi.org/10.24036/ld.v4i1.7392>
- [3] Anderson, K. T. (2013). Contrasting systemic functional linguistic and situated literacies approaches to multimodality in literacy and writing studies. *Written Communication*, 30(3), 276–299. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088313488073>
- [4] Anderson, K. T., & Kachorsky, D. (2019). Assessing Students' Multimodal Compositions: An Analysis of the Literature. *English Teaching, Practice & Critique*, 18(3), 312–334. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ETPC-11-2018-0092>
- [5] Andreev, A. V., & Usova, N. A. (2019). Application of the principles of pedagogical design in the design of informatics lessons. *RUDN Journal of Informatization in Education*, 16(4), 308–317. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-8631-2019-16-4-308-317>
- [6] Arasit, A. K. (2023). The Constructivist Approach to Student's Metacognitive Formation. *IJEDR: Indonesian Journal of Education and Development Research*, 1(1), 7–16. <https://doi.org/10.57235/ijedr.v1i1.1094>

- [7] Badjeber, R., Purwaningrum, J., & Kudus, U. M. (2018). Pengembangan Higher Order Thinking Skills [Development of Higher Order Thinking Skills]. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pembelajaran*, 1(1), 36–43. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joa.12117>
- [8] Bahtiar, A., & Nasrullah, A. (2019). Multiliterasi dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia untuk Penutur Asing (BIPA) Berbasis Sastra Warna Lokal Betawi Di Uin Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta [Multiliteracy in Indonesian Language Learning for Foreign Speakers (BIPA) Based on Betawi Local Color Literature at UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta]. *Bahasa: Jurnal Keilmuan Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 1(1), 28–43. <https://doi.org/10.26499/bahasa.v1i1.25>
- [9] Bloom, B. S. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals*. D. Mckay Co. <http://ezproxy.uow.edu.au/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat03332a&AN=uow.b1184472&site=eds-live> on June 16, 2024.
- [10] Botelho, M. J., Kerekes, J., Jang, E. E., & Stagg Peterson, S. (2014). Assessing Multiliteracies: Mismatches and Opportunities. *Language and Literacy*, 16(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.20360/G21G6W>
- [11] Botezatu, V. (2023). Feedback in formative assessment: strategies to optimize student learning. *Journal of Pedagogy - Revista de Pedagogie, LXXI(2)*, 175–194. <https://doi.org/10.26755/revped/2023.2/175>
- [12] Brown, I. L., Lockyer, L., & Caputi, P. (2010). *Multiliteracies and Assessment Practice*. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:238351052> on June 14, 2024.
- [13] Buckley-Walker, K., Tognolini, J., Lockyer, L., Brown, I., & Caputi, P. (2017). Evaluating the validity of the online multiliteracy assessment tool. *Australian Journal of Education*, 61(3), 305–327. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0004944117729056>
- [14] Carraro, K. (2023). Multiliteracies and self-directed language learning in an academic setting. *European Journal of Language Policy*, 15(2), 245–272. <https://doi.org/10.3828/ejlp.2023.13>
- [15] Chan-Anteza, T. K. (2020). Management of a Conducive Classroom Environment: A Meta-synthesis. *Management*, 11(26), 54–70. <https://doi.org/10.7176/JEP/11-26-06>
- [16] Chaudhary, S. (2024). Challenges in Student Centered Learning. *International Journal for Research in Applied Science and Engineering Technology*, 12(7), 983–986. <https://doi.org/10.22214/ijraset.2024.63702>
- [17] Churches, A. (2009). *Bloom's Digital Taxonomy v3.01*. <https://edorigami.wikispaces.com/file/view/bloom%27spDigitalptaxonomypv3.01.pdf> on June 14, 2024.
- [18] Cooper, N., Lockyer, L., & Brown, I. (2013). Developing multiliteracies in a technology-mediated environment. *Educational Media International*, 50(2), 93–107. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09523987.2013.795350>
- [19] Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2005). *Multiliteracies: Literacy Learning and the Design of Social Futures*. Routledge.
- [20] Crean, M., & Prunty, C. (2011). *Formative Assessment Structures to Enhance Student Learning Despite Resource Limitations*. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:55569579> on June 13, 2024.
- [21] Davies, A. (1997). Demands of being professional in language testing. *Language Testing*, 14(3), 328–339. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026553229701400309>
- [22] Dawson, T. L. (2020). Rethinking Educational Assessment in Light of a Strong Theory of Development. In *Handbook of Integrative Developmental Science* (Vol. 12, pp. 423–450). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003018599-17>
- [23] de Andrade Pereira, M. (2001). *Pedagogical principles in web-based learning*. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:54220862> on June 16, 2024.
- [24] Dolin, J., Bruun, J., Nielsen, S. S., Jensen, S. B., & Nieminen, P. (2018). *The Structured Assessment Dialogue* (pp. 109–140). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-63248-3_5
- [25] Draditaswari, S. Y. (2024). Critical Appreciation Learning Design in Examining Political Values in Literary Works. *JISIP (Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Pendidikan)*, 8(1), 554. <https://doi.org/10.58258/jisip.v8i1.6361>
- [26] Elihami. (2019). Implementasi Layanan Bimbingan Kelompok dalam Meningkatkan Higher of Think Mahasiswa Berbasis Kampus Merdeka. *Edu Psy Couns: Journal of Education, Psychology and Counseling*, 1(1), 79–86.
- [27] Ellaway, R. H. (2019). Designs for Professional Learning. In *Rethinking Pedagogy for a Digital Age* (pp. 197–211). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351252805-13>
- [28] Erniwati, E., Mertosono, S. R., & Maghfira, M. (2023). Reading Comprehension and Literary Appreciation: An Analysis of Students Difficulties. *Interference: Journal of Language, Literature, and Linguistics*, 4(2), 254. <https://doi.org/10.26858/interference.v4i2.51863>
- [29] Fernández-Costales, A. (2023). Cognitive development in CLIL. In *The Routledge Handbook of Content and Language Integrated Learning* (Issue 5, pp. 127–140). Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10648-3>
- [30] Frollova, V., Simonova, I., & Poullova, P. (2017). Learning style and its reflection in Assessment Format Preference. *2016 IEEE Conference on E-Learning, e-Management and e-Services, IC3e 2016*, 64–69. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IC3e.2016.8009041>
- [31] Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (1983). *Educational Research: An Introduction (4th ed.)*. Pearson Education, Inc.
- [32] Garayev, E. (2023). Basic pedagogical concepts, principles of social pedagogy. *Ancient Land*, 5(6), 56–60. <https://doi.org/10.36719/2706-6185/24/56-60>
- [33] Gijbels, D., Van de Watering, G., Dochy, F., & Van den Bossche, P. (2005). The relationship between students' approaches to learning and the assessment of learning outcomes. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 20(4), 327–341. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03173560>
- [34] Hendriani, A., Tri Herlambang, Y., Rohayati, E., Ernalis, & Setiawan, D. (2021). Critical Multiliteration: An Alternative Learning Model for Developing Metacognition Skills in Elementary School Students. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1764(1). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1764/1/012091>
- [35] Holdren, T. S. (2012). Using art to assess reading comprehension and critical thinking in adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 55(8), 692–703. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/JAAL.00084>
- [36] I Dewa Ayu Made Meilani Pramesti. (2024). Exploring the benefits of formative assessment in the classroom. *Esteem Journal of English Education Study Programme*, 6(1), 188–194. <https://doi.org/10.31851/esteem.v6i1.16142>
- [37] Iman, N., DS, A., Arifin, S., & Cholifah, U. (2021, February 5). *Generosity Education for Children (Case Study at Mi Muhammadiyah Dolopo Madiun)*. <https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.27-10-2020.2304184>

- [38] Jacobs, G. E. (2013). Designing Assessments: A Multiliteracies Approach. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 56(8), 623–626. <https://doi.org/10.1002/JAAL.189>
- [39] Johnstone, C., Ketterlin Geller, L. R., & Thurlow, M. (2022). Opportunities and Limitations of Accommodations and Accessibility in Higher Education Assessment. In *Assessment for Inclusion in Higher Education: Promoting Equity and Social Justice in Assessment* (pp. 131–141). Taylor and Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003293101-15>
- [40] Kalantzis, M., Cope, B., & Harvey, A. (2003). Assessing multiliteracies and the new basics. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 10(1), 15–26.
- [41] Karkar Esperat, T. M. (2024). Multiliteracies in Teacher Education. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.1890>
- [42] Kaufman, A. S. (1978). The importance of basic concepts in the individual assessment of preschool children. *Journal of School Psychology*, 16(3), 207–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-4405\(78\)90002-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-4405(78)90002-X)
- [43] Khamidullaevna, A. U. (2022). Pedagogical principles of systematic analysis. *Current Research Journal of Pedagogics*, 03(05), 81–87. <https://doi.org/10.37547/pedagogics-crjp-03-05-14>
- [44] Kim Anh, N. T. (2024). Assessing Pedagogical Students' Learning Outcomes Through a Competency-Based Approach. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 7767–7776. <https://doi.org/10.53555/kuey.v30i5.4232>
- [45] Landry, S. J. (2016). State modeling to identify critical situations. *2016 Resilience Week (RWS)*, pp. 178–183. <https://doi.org/10.1109/RWEEK.2016.7573329>
- [46] Laskar, A. H., & Bhattacharjee, S. (2022). Teachers awareness on constructivist approach in learning. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, pp. 4313–4332. <https://doi.org/10.53730/ijhs.v6nS1.5792>
- [47] LaVelle, J. M., Lovato, C., & Stephenson, C. L. (2020). Pedagogical considerations for the teaching of evaluation. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, p. 79, 101786. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2020.101786>
- [48] Layoc, J. B. (2024). Transformative Assessment: A Tool in Improving Performance Tasks of Grade 11 Students in Language Subjects. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2024.0025>
- [49] Lo, Y. Y., & Leung, C. (2022). Conceptualising assessment literacy of teachers in content and Language Integrated learning programmes. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 224(3), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joa.12117>
- [50] Menonides, D., Smit, A., Talsma, I., Swart, J., & Broersma, M. (2024). Digital Literacies as Socially Situated Pedagogical Processes: Genealogically Understanding Media, Information, and Digital Literacies. *Media and Communication*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.17645/mac.8174>
- [51] Minavvarovna, U. S., Turgunovna, Y. D., Soliyevna, M. N., & Adxamovna, I. D. (2022). Didactic bases of special education, content of education, principles of education. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, 10360–10366. <https://doi.org/10.53730/ijhs.v6nS3.9433>
- [52] Misaa, M., Purwati, O., & Retnaningdyah, P. (2022). Multiliteracy pedagogical framework in action: Critical reading in ELT classroom by implementing critical framing. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, 17(12), 4311–4323. <https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v17i12.8547>
- [53] Mishra, N. R. (2023). Constructivist Approach to Learning: An Analysis of Pedagogical Models of Social Constructivist Learning Theory. *Journal of Research and Development*, 6(01), 22–29. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jrdn.v6i01.55227>
- [54] Nash, B. (2018). Exploring Multimodal Writing in Secondary English Classrooms: A Literature Review. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 17(4), 324–356. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ETPC-01-2018-0012>
- [55] Nasya Putri Nabila, Fandra Apriyandi Rahayu, & Elfina, E. M. R. (2024). Encourage students to think critical and innovative with the problem based learning model. *Satmata: Journal of Historical Education Studies*, 2(1), 17–22. <https://doi.org/10.61677/satmata.v2i1.176>
- [56] Nazim qızı Talışinski, N. (2022). Müasir təhsil sistemində fəal təlimin prinsipləri. *Scientific Work*, 77(4), 147–151. <https://doi.org/10.36719/2663-4619/77/147-151>
- [57] Neina, Q. A., & Wagiran. (2023). Penilaian Multiliterasi Dalam Pembelajaran Sastra Berbasis Authentic Assessment [Multiliteracy Assessment in Literature Learning Based on Authentic Assessment]. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional PIBSI Ke-44*, 224(3), pp. 282-291.
- [58] Nikoladze, M. (2023). Student-centered educational process and protection of children's rights. *Enadakultura*, focus. <https://doi.org/10.52340/lac.2023.30.22>
- [59] Nitko, A. J. (1989). Designing Tests that are Integrated with Instruction. In R. L. Linn (Ed.), *Educational measurement* (3rd ed., pp. 447–474). Macmillan Publishing Co, Inc; American Council on Education.
- [60] Nuryani, P., Abidin, Y., & Herlambang, Y. T. (2019). Model Pedagogik Multiliterasi dalam Mengembangkan Keterampilan Berpikir Abad ke-21 [Multiliteracy Pedagogic Model in Developing 21st Century Thinking Skills]. *EduHumaniora | Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar Kampus Cibiru*, 11(2), 117–126. <https://doi.org/10.17509/eh.v11i2.18821>
- [61] Patterson, B. A. B. B., Munoz, L., Abrams, L., & Bass, C. (2015). Transformative Learning: A Case for Using Grounded Theory as an Assessment Analytic. *Teaching Theology and Religion*, 18(4), 303–325. <https://doi.org/10.1111/teth.12301>
- [62] Pellegrino, J. W. (2018). Assessment of and for Learning. In *International Handbook of the Learning Sciences* (pp. 410–421). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315617572-40>
- [63] Pérez Cavana, M. L. (2012). Autonomy and self-assessment of individual learning styles using the European Language Portfolio (ELP). *Language Learning in Higher Education*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.1515/cercles-2011-0014>
- [64] Pieper, V. (2020). Literary Appreciation in the Framework of Positivism. *Journal of Literary Theory*, 14(1), 76–93. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jlt-2020-0005>
- [65] Popham, W. J. (1995). *Classroom Assessment: What Teachers Need to Know*. Allyn and Bacon.
- [66] Prihatini, A., & Sugiarti, S. (2020). Pembelajaran multiliterasi pada mata pelajaran bahasa Indonesia [Multiliteracy learning in Indonesian subjects]. *Prosiding Seminar Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia (SENASBASA)*. <http://research-report.umm.ac.id/index.php/SENASBASA> on June 16, 2024.
- [67] Radzitskaya, Y., & Tasbulatova, G. (2024). Student-centered learning as a pedagogical problem. *3i Intellect Idea Innovation - Интеллект Идея Инновация*, 2, 191–198. https://doi.org/10.52269/22266070_2024_2_191

- [68] Ranjana, L. (2022). Usage of Constructivist Approach for Critical Thinking. *Research Review International Journal of Multidisciplinary*, 7(9), 69–73. <https://doi.org/10.31305/riijm.2022.v07.i09.010>
- [69] Romiaty, Apriatama, D., Pangestie, E. P., & Stevandy, M. (2024). Development of student needs assessment guidelines in planning guidance and counseling programs. *Education*, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.59397/edu.v2i1.19>
- [70] Rosado, M. J., Puyana, V. P., García, A. R., Ruíz, C. B., & Ángel, M. F. (2022). Continuous assessment strategies as a way to motivate students in Technology careers. *Afinidad*, 79(596), 46–51. <https://doi.org/10.55815/401090>
- [71] Sahni, S. (2018). Integrating Assessments in Innovative Learning Process. In *The Future of Higher Education in the Middle East and Africa (Vol. 1, Issue 1, pp. 105–124)*. Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-64656-5_10
- [72] Savva, S. (2019). Multiliteracies performance assessment zones (MPAZ): A new tool to explore multimodal interactions for virtual learning. In *Cases on Immersive Virtual Reality Techniques* (pp. 165–198). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-5912-2.ch008>
- [73] Saxena, V. (2018). Adapting, appropriating, writing: Towards a digital classroom of literature. In *Preparing the Next Generation of Teachers for 21st Century Education* (pp. 287–301). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-4080-9.ch017>
- [74] Seglem, R., & Garcia, A. (2022). Multiliteracies in Classrooms. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education* (Vol. 1764, Issue 1). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.1803>
- [75] Sholehudin, M., Waluyo, H. J., Suyitno, S., & Wardhani, N. E. (2019). Exploring the Use of Prose Appreciation Textbooks in Indonesian Higher Education Context: The Study of Multiculturalism Integration. *Proceedings of the Third International Conference of Arts, Language and Culture (ICALC 2018)*, 14(1), 76–93. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icalc-18.2019.52>
- [76] Simonova, I., & Poulouva, P. (2014). Personalized learning and assessment. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (Including Subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)*, 8613 LNCS, 159–165. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-09635-3_17
- [77] Sofyan, M., Barnes, M., & Finefter-Rosenbluh, I. (2024). Fair assessment as an aspect of effective teaching: teachers' and students' perceptions of and positioning within assessment practices in Indonesian vocational higher education. *Journal of Vocational Education and Training*, 76(4), 795–817. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13636820.2022.2098170>
- [78] T M, H., & Gupta, Dr. S. K. (2022). Pedagogical Principles in Learning and Its Impact on Enhancing Motivation of Students. *Technoarete Transactions on Application of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in Education*, 1(4). <https://doi.org/10.36647/TTAICTE/01.04.A004>
- [79] Tai, J. (2023). Moving beyond reasonable adjustments: supporting employability through inclusive assessment design. *Journal of Teaching and Learning for Graduate Employability*, 14(2), 70–86. <https://doi.org/10.21153/jtlge2023vol14no2art1785>
- [80] Tan, S. Y. (2018). Rethinking Our Education to Face the New Industry Era. *Proceedings of EDULEARN 18 Conference*, pp. 65–66.
- [81] Tang, K. H. D. (2023). Student-centered Approach in Teaching and Learning: What Does It Really Mean? *Acta Pedagogica Asiana*, 2(2), 72–83. <https://doi.org/10.53623/apga.v2i2.218>
- [82] Thaba-Nkadimene, K. L., & Molotja, T. W. (2021). Critical and Capability Theories as a Framework to Improve Multigrade Teaching. In *Perspectives on Multigrade Teaching* (pp. 57–70). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-84803-3_4
- [83] Thibaut, P., & Curwood, J. S. (2018). Multiliteracies in Practice: Integrating Multimodal Production Across the Curriculum. *Theory Into Practice*, 57(1), 48–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2017.1392202>
- [84] Turcsanyi-Szabo, M. (2012). Aiming at Sustainable Innovation in Teacher Education –From Theory to Practice. *Atsinaujinanci UInovaciju Siekimas Mokytoju Rengime –Nuo Teorijos Prie Praktikos*, 11(1), 115–130.
- [85] Walsh, M. (2017). Multiliteracies, multimodality, new literacies and. What do these mean for literacy education? *International Perspectives on Inclusive Education*, pp. 11, 19–33. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-363620170000011002>
- [86] Wang, Y. (2021). On the Application of Situational Education in Prose Teaching. *2021 2nd International Conference on Computers, Information Processing and Advanced Education*, pp. 908–911. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3456887.3457102>
- [87] Wilson, M., & Tan, S. (2023). Principled assessment design. In *International Encyclopedia of Education (Fourth Edition)* (pp. 146–162). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-818630-5.10022-3>
- [88] Yavuz, A. (2014). Teaching and Interpreting Literary Texts: Difficulties of 4th Year ELT Students at a Turkish University. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, pp. 158, 27–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.12.028>
- [89] Zammit, K. (2018). "We're all real serious filmmakers": learning about and creating multimodal mini-documentaries. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 17(4), 371–386. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1108/ETPC-11-2017-0161>



Qurrota Ayu Neina was born in Salatiga, Indonesia. She received her Master of Education (M.Pd.) in the same field from Universitas Negeri Semarang, Semarang, Indonesia 2015. She is pursuing a Ph.D. in Indonesian Language Education, funded by the Agency for the Assessment and Application of Technology (BPPT) and the Indonesia Endowment Fund for Education (LPDP).

She has held various academic positions, including serving as a lecturer at Universitas Negeri Semarang, where she teaches courses in Indonesian language education. Her previous work includes research on language acquisition and literacy development. She has published papers on curriculum development in language teaching and assessment models, with notable works including “Literacy Development in Higher Education” (2020) and “Multiliteracy and Assessment in Language Learning” (2021). Her current research interests involve

critical pedagogy and multiliteracy in language education. Ms. Qurrota Ayu Neina is an Indonesian Language Teachers Association member.



Agus Nuryatin was born in Pekalongan, Indonesia. He received his Doctorate (Dr.) in Literature from Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia 2002. He has worked as a professor at Universitas Negeri Semarang, specializing in teaching literature. His work includes extensive research on literary theory and its application in educational settings. He has published numerous papers and books on the subject, including *Sastra dalam Pendidikan* (2008), *Kritik Sastra Indonesia Modern* (2012), and *Metodologi Pengajaran Sastra* (2015). His current research focuses on innovative pedagogies in literature education and integrating digital media into teaching literature. Prof. Dr. Agus Nuryatin is a member of several professional organizations, including the Indonesian Association for Literary Studies (HISKI).



RM Teguh Supriyanto was born in Surakarta, Indonesia. He earned his Doctorate (Dr.) in Literature from Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, Indonesia 2005. He is a professor at Universitas Negeri Semarang specializing in Indonesian literature and literary criticism. Over the years, he has worked on various projects developing Indonesian literary studies, particularly in traditional and modern Indonesian literature. His publications include *Kebudayaan Jawa dalam Sastra Modern* (2010), *Estetika Sastra Nusantara* (2014), and *Pengajaran Sastra Berbasis Kearifan Lokal* (2018). His research focuses on the intersection of literature, culture, and education, particularly on local wisdom in literary pedagogy. Prof. Dr. RM Teguh Supriyanto is an active member of the Indonesian Literary Scholars Association (HISKI).



Hari Bakti Mardikantoro was born in Magelang, Indonesia. He received his Doctorate (Dr.) in Linguistics from Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, Indonesia 2009. He is a professor at Universitas Negeri Semarang, specializing in linguistics and language education. He has conducted extensive research in sociolinguistics, language policy, and the development of language teaching methodologies. His publications include *Sosiolinguistik: Teori dan Aplikasi* (2012), *Bahasa dan Identitas Sosial* (2016), and *Pengembangan Kurikulum Pembelajaran Bahasa* (2020). His current research interests involve the relationship between language and identity and innovations in Indonesian language teaching. Prof. Dr. Hari Bakti Mardikantoro is a member of professional organizations such as the Linguistic Society of Indonesia (MLI) and the Indonesian Association of Language Teachers (APSI).



U'um Qomariyah was born in Rembang, Indonesia. She received her Doctorate (Dr.) in Indonesian Literature from Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia, in 2024. She is a lecturer at Universitas Negeri Semarang, teaching Indonesian literature and literary criticism courses. Her research studies traditional Indonesian literature, narrative structures, and feminist literary theory. She has published works such as *Narasi Perempuan dalam Sastra Indonesia* (2015) and *Sastra Lisan Nusantara* (2018). Her current research examines gender representation in Indonesian folk narratives and contemporary literature. Dr. U'um Qomariyah is a member of the Indonesian Literary Scholars Association (HISKI).



Muhamad Burhanudin was born in Magelang, Indonesia. He earned his Doctorate (Dr.) in Literature from Universitas Negeri, Semarang, Indonesia, in 2024. He is a lecturer at Universitas Negeri Semarang, specializing in coastal literature. His research focuses on the literary traditions of coastal communities, particularly their oral narratives, cultural values, and unique aesthetic forms. He has published works such as *Sastra Pesisiran: Kajian Narasi dan Budaya* (2017) and *Tradisi Lisan Masyarakat Pesisir Utara Jawa* (2020). His current research examines the influence of maritime culture on regional literature and its role in shaping local identity. Dr. Muhamad Burhanudin is a member of the Indonesian Literary Scholars Association (HISKI).