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ABSTRACT: This article explores the possibilities offered by multiliteracies pedagogy as an inclusive pedagogical practice for adults. The main aim of this narrative review is to summarize the benefits of the multiliteracies approach for adult learners and to synthesize the best language practices of this approach for adult learners. The PRISMA protocol was followed to assess the research published between 2011 and 2021. Using the SPIDER search tool, studies with adults aged 16+ were selected. Finally, the mixed methods assessment tool MMAT was used for critical appraisal of the studies. The analysis shows that studies contextualized their research within a variety of conceptual topics related to adult multiliteracies: multimodal classroom practices, teachers’ professional development, family-based literacy practices, literacy and identity, affective factors and translingualism as a pedagogical practice in adult education. Our findings offer an updated conceptualization of multiliteracies for adult learners. We conclude that an adult learner-centered perspective seems still to be underdeveloped. A framework including all types of literacies, connecting multimodality to multilingualism, acculturation and social resilience is still needed to better understand the language acquisition process of adult learners.
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Multiliteracidades para aprendientes de lenguas adultos: una revisión narrativa

RESUMEN Este artículo explora la pedagogía de las multiliteracidades como práctica pedagógica inclusiva para adultos. El objetivo principal de esta revisión narrativa es sintetizar los beneficios del enfoque de multiliteracidad y concretar las mejores prácticas lingüísticas de este enfoque para estudiantes adultos. Se siguió el protocolo PRISMA para evaluar investigaciones publicadas entre 2011 y 2021. Mediante la herramienta de búsqueda SPIDER, se seleccionaron estudios con adultos mayores de 16 años. Finalmente, se utilizó la herramienta de evaluación de métodos mixtos MMAT para la valoración crítica de los estudios. El análisis muestra una variedad de temas conceptuales relacionados con las multiliteracidades para adultos: las prácticas multimodales en el aula, el desarrollo profesional de los profesores, las prácticas de alfabetización basadas en la familia, la alfabetización y la identidad, los factores afectivos y el translingüismo como práctica pedagógica en la educación de adultos. Nuestros resultados ofrecen una conceptualización actualizada de la pedagogía de las multiliteracidades para estudiantes adultos y concluimos que este enfoque está todavía poco desarrollado. Sigue siendo necesario un marco que incluya todos los tipos de alfabetización y que conecte la multimodalidad con el multilingüismo, la aculturación y la resiliencia social para comprender mejor el proceso de adquisición de lenguas de los estudiantes adultos.

Palabras clave: multiliteracidad, educación de adultos, aprendizaje de lenguas, alfabetización, multimodalidad.
1. Introduction

Research on literacies and additional languages claims for new approaches to literacy problems and recommends a pedagogy of multiliteracies as an inclusive pedagogical practice (Florian, 2015). Literacy in an additional language is very much needed for people who want to find a new life in another country, yet not all adults are fully literate. Mobility and globalization are closely related to second language learning because language is at the heart of education for social development and citizens’ literacy influences their social performance. Migration has also profoundly changed the concept of literacy due to, among others, the huge cultural and linguistic diversity and the different profiles of adult language learners. This diversity affects, without any doubt, the needs of adults when facing language education, especially when low literacy is still a challenge in our society. Although adults’ oral communication abilities for face-to-face or virtual interactions cannot be forgotten, many other types of literacies seem to be of interest as well.

An example is the problem of low digital for adult migrants who need to integrate in a new society. For instance, these adults need to open a bank account or to fill in the form to take the required language test to obtain residence in the new country, and both are done nowadays digitally. This exemplifies the potential contribution of digital to adult literacy and language education about which there is controversy (Warschauer & Liaw, 2010; Graessner et al., 2019), although some studies with adults (Sepulveda, Edwards, Vasseur & Elola, 2022) suggest benefits that deserve to be further explored.

The New London Group connected literacy pedagogy with multimedia technologies (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000), an updated concept as multimodality and digital culture surround us. Research shows that multimodal elements such as visual, audio, gestural and linguistic ones affect meaning-processing and could have an impact on literacy development (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000). Actually, research seems to point to “more agentive engagements in language brokering that recommend refugee students’ involvement in digital literacies and multimodality to adapt to resettlement” (Karam, 2018, p. 512). The use of digital technologies has become even wider during the COVID-19 pandemic.

The pedagogy of multiliteracies by Cazden et al. (1996) represents a shift from print-based literacy to the 21st Century multiple modes through which learners may make meaning and learn. Multiliteracies still remind us of several essential societal challenges as regards language learning: the beneficial use of multimodality, the development of citizens’ critical framing competence and the appropriate implementation of inclusion practices.

In this way, learners’ socio-emotional literacy becomes also relevant as a new community and a new language and culture affects their identity and sense of belonging. Although there are some successful models of linguistic integration of adult migrants, unfortunately, some language policies may violate the dignity of migrants. Beacco, Krumm & Little (2017) describes two circumstances when this may occur: when a language test denies the possibility of residence or citizenship and when the suppression of the mother tongue is implied as this affects migrants’ identity and self-concept. In fact, even the policy of some countries asking migrants to take a language course, for instance, does not warrant social integration nor direct employment. Some language courses do not consider all adult learners’ language needs, probably due to the huge differences between their needs for colloquial speech and the language demanded in their workplaces. But becoming literate
in the vocabulary and expressions of their jobs or becoming literate in the legal regulations of the new country means more chances of integration in their workplaces and the society they live in.

In fact, considering teaching and learning channels that not only acknowledge the linguistic but also the visual, musical, spatial, gestural, aesthetic, among others, open different lines of research in applied linguistics (Bataller Catalá & Reyes-Torres, 2019; Sánchez-Vizcaíno & Fonseca-Mora, 2019; Toscano-Fuentes, & Fernández-Corbacho, 2020). But not much has been said about how the plurilingualism of many of these adult language learners connects to multimodality, both concepts crucial to the challenges of considering adult migrants´needs (Beacco, 2014).

Therefore, for this contemporary and global reality, we want to observe the benefits of the multiliteracies approach for adult learners that have been described. We hope, in this way, to synthesize the best language teaching practices for at-risk language learners´needs to prepare future teachers to work with this type of plurilingual learners in face-to-face, hybrid or online contexts.

2. Conceptualisations of the Linguistic Integration of Adult Migrants

Much of the previous research on linguistic integration of adult migrants has been exploratory in nature. A significant analysis and discussion on the subject was presented by García & Kleifgen (2020), while analyzing the adult foreign-language learner’s linguistic behaviour. These researchers argue against the ideological perspective of the native speaker opposed to the non-native speaker, and against the additive nature of bilingualism. The first one because it supports “an ideology of racial, class, and gender superiority in multilingual societies” (p.556) based on the acknowledgement of the native speaker’s superiority, a status the migrant very rarely will acquire. Moreover, this perspective forgets that adult migrants already possess at least their mother tongue, if not many other languages, and a semiotic repertoire that already allows them to “read the world” (p.565).

On the other hand, García & Kleifgen (2020) propose to observe adult migrants’ translanguaging practices. According to them, translanguaging “focuses on the actions [...] that include the unbounded dynamic and fluid use of multilinguals’ entire linguistic repertoire—a notion which goes beyond traditional understandings of language, literacy, and bilingualism” (p.555). Research into these interactions and the communicative needs that arise from them could have an impact on the design of better teaching in line with the interactional demands of these plurilingual learners (Simpson, 2020). Therefore, all of the above indicates the existence of an area of research that still needs to find solutions to these problems, as the lack of adult literacy in an additional language may imply social exclusion. In addition, and according to Pettitt & Tarone (2015), recognising and including learners of various literacy levels and educational backgrounds allows us to develop theories of acquisition that consider different language learning contexts while inviting us to design more detailed instruments and research methodologies appropriate to this study population.
3. RATIONALE AND AIDS

There is a growing body of literature that has been (and is currently being) developed over the last decade about the impact of new literacies such as multiliteracies in adult education. The approach of the multiliteracy paradigm encourages teachers and learners to engage with different literacy ways (not only linguistically), but also visual, spatial and multimodal as new modalities to learn. Given the nature of adult migrant learners considered as non-traditional language students, the need of a model that combines the process of understanding the information and the design and negotiation of meaning through a variety of methods of different nature is more than evident.

Our main objectives are to summarize the findings of previous research carried out in this field by reviewing the research designs followed, the types of literacies included and the language teaching strategies used. By first assessing the quality of the literature in a critical way, this study provides an explicit basis for practices to improve adult migrant educational programs. The mapping of the terrain as regards multiliteracies for adult-foreign-language learners will provide a non-aligned evaluation and, as a consequence, the identification of new addresses for further research.

4. METHODOLOGY

4.1. Study Design

The PRISMA protocol was chosen to assess the full extent of literature on the topic (Moher et al., 2009). Primary research studies that use quantitative, qualitative or mixed-methods approaches were selected. Due to this tool, we could provide the available research and create evidence summaries that can be used by decision makers to intervene in the programs and to address new directions for future research (Pearson et al., 2014). The consideration of multiple research methods allowed the researchers to synthesize research with significant results for the scientific community. For the inclusion criteria the SPIDER search tool (Cooke et al., 2012) was used. This resource helped to define the sample, the study of interest, the research design, the evaluation and the methodology followed. These parameters were crucial to identify research that used quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods in design. In other words, this validated tool was helpful to select the appropriate studies for this systematic review.

Finally, to provide a critical appraisal of the studies (Pace et al., 2012) the mixed methods assessment tool known as MMAT (Pluye et al., 2011) was used. This tool has the particularity to assess critically all types of research designs. It also facilitates a standardized approach that makes easier to compare studies of different methodologies (Crowe and Shеппantidad, 2011), it shows reliability when used independently by multiple reviewers (Souto et al., 2015) and it uses a wide range of different topics in systematic reviews (Hong et al., 2018).

4.2. Protocol for the Systematic Review: target population and search strategy

Due to the lack of systematic reviews on this subject, the protocol includes review questions, search strategies, inclusion and exclusion criteria and assessment tools to ensure
the quality of the studies (Moher et al., 2009). Our search strategy looked for studies that refer to adult education. The phenomenon of interest analyzed is the use and effectiveness of multiliteracy pedagogy in formal and informal literacy education. The inclusion criteria comprises all study designs in order to assess the full range of literature on the topic to date. Studies that focus on non-traditional adult learners to the age group from 16 to older were selected. The educational background of the majority of participants were adult migrants with limited or non-formal education and literacy. In most of the cases, students attended non-formal learning institutions with training programs on literacy skills provided by social community institutions.

Key electronic scientific databases were browsed to identify the most relevant papers on the topic following different steps. Firstly, eligible studies were found by an electronic research conducted by two reviewers. The selection includes research conducted from 2011 to 31 August 2021. The following databases were used: 1findr, ERIC, SCOPUS and WOS. The selection of these databases was made by the rigor and relevance according to the topic. The aim was to provide the most relevant studies on adult migrant literacy and the impact of the multiliteracy approach. Different search filters were used to maximize the specificity of the search (Hopewell et al., 2007).

Secondly, there were no restrictions on the geographical parameters, but there were limitations on the dates, only papers published in the last ten years were considered for inclusion. Studies included in the review are all peer-reviewed articles that were published in English or Spanish. Our keywords were: multiliteracy/ies, multilingualism, new literacy/ies, multiple literacies, adult/s and adult education. In order to accomplish best results, inverted commas in all of the terms were used to ensure the finding of all studies related to the main topic. Finally, boolean logical operators were used during the search strategy to create different possible combinations of keywords in every database.

4.3. Data collection, inclusion and exclusion criteria and selection of studies

As it was mentioned earlier, the same inclusion criteria were applied to all the studies:
1. All selected papers were peer-reviewed in academic journals.
2. All selected papers were written in English and/or Spanish.
3. All selected papers were published from 2011 to 2021.
4. All selected papers focused on multiliteracy pedagogy, on literacy education for adults, or multilingualism, new literacy or multiple literacies in adult education.
5. All selected papers included adult migrants aged from 16 years onwards.
6. All selected papers focused on non-formal learning institutions or social community institutions.
7. All selected papers were published in Humanities, Arts, Social Sciences, Applied Sciences, Health Sciences and Economics.

The following exclusion criteria were applied to avoid non-pertinent papers to this systematic review:
1. Non-peer-reviewed papers.
2. Papers written in a different language rather than English or Spanish.
4. Papers not focused on the phenomenon of interest.
5. Papers that included participants under the age of 16.
6. Papers based on formal high educational settings as College or University.

In order to merge search results, the reference management software Mendeley was used to remove the duplicates and select the most relevant papers. Two reviewers independently screened the titles and abstracts to select the papers. Subsequently, most of the articles were retrieved through Interlibrary Loan and were reviewed full-text by the first author and checked by the second researcher in order to ensure the appropriate assessment following the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Both reviewers agreed on the final list of selected papers for the systematic review. A PRISMA flow diagram documents the process of selection (see Figure 1).

![Flow diagram for study inclusion adapted from Moher et al. (2009)](image URL)

**Figure 1. Flow diagram for study inclusion adapted from Moher et al. (2009)**
In total, 20 articles were retained for inclusion in the systematic review, references and titles are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1.** *Selected peer-reviewed studies published 2011-2021*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>Titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bataller and Reyes, 2019</td>
<td>La pedagogía de las multiliteracidades y la experiencia estética como elementos clave en la enseñanza y el aprendizaje de lenguas. Por la consolidación de un paradigma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhatia and Ritchie, 2016</td>
<td>Multilingual Language Mixing and Creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boon et al., 2020</td>
<td>Adult literacy classes in Timor-Leste and diverse language values and practices across the regions: implications for language policy-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boon, 2013</td>
<td>Multilingual classroom talk in adult literacy education in Timor-Leste: teachers and learners doing literacy and numeracy tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgess, 2020</td>
<td>Through a lens of affect: multiliteracies, English learners, and resistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgess and Rowsell, 2020</td>
<td>Transcultural-Affective Flows and Multimodal Engagements: Reimagining Pedagogy and Assessment with Adult Language Learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstick, 2019</td>
<td>Literacy, power and practices: taking a discourse-ethnographic approach to exploring adult literacy practices in Pakistan and the UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D’Agostino &amp; Mocciaro, 2021</td>
<td>Literacy and literacy practices: Plurilingual connected migrants and emerging literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gynne, 2019</td>
<td>‘English or Swedish please, no Dari!’—(trans) languaging and language policing in upper secondary school’s language introduction programme in Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holloway, 2021</td>
<td>The multiliteracies project: preservice and in-service teachers learning by design in diverse content areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holloway &amp; Gouthro, 2020</td>
<td>Using a multiliteracies approach to foster critical and creative pedagogies for adult learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobs et al., 2014</td>
<td>Production and Consumption: A Closer Look at Adult Digital Literacy Acquisition Digital Literacy Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaur, 2016</td>
<td>Everyday literacy practices of a former Syrian refugee: Strengths and struggles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King et al., 2017</td>
<td>New to School and New to Print: Everyday Peer Interaction Among Adolescent High School Newcomers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morita-Mullaney et al., 2019</td>
<td>Multiliteracies in Rural Communities: The “Revuelto y Mezclado” of Home and Community Literacy Practices of Midwestern Emergent Bilingual Families</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4. Data Analysis

In order to verify the quality of these studies, the MMAT known as the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (Pluye et al., 2011) was used. This tool allows us to assess the validity, accuracy and contribution to the preexisting knowledge on the phenomenon of investigation. The appraisal was done independently by both reviewers to report on the quality of the studies. The MMAT checklist starts with two screening questions for all types of studies that focus on research questions and on the collected data and ensure that only empirical studies are analyzed. All included studies received positive answers to these initial questions from both reviewers and studies were differentiated into the qualitative paradigm (90%) and the mixed methods design (10%). The other items of the MMAT checklist helped reviewers to reflect on methodological quality criteria related to the research designs, the data source, the outputs and the interpretations. As can be seen in table 2, only 60% of the studies followed all methodological quality criteria.

Table 2. Results of Mixed Methods Appraisal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MMAT CRITERIA/ OVERALL QUALIFY SCORE</th>
<th>N STUDIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Results

Due to the diversity of the studies, we considered precise to offer a narrative synthesis to present the results of this systematic review. To detail the outcomes of the studies, Annex: “Summary of findings” gives basic information about the included papers and provides a brief synthesis of all primary outcomes reported in the selected studies.

As regards the research methods, the qualitative studies (n = 18) used mainly a combination of audio-video recordings, photographs of literacy artifacts and interviews for data collection. The mixed-methods studies (n = 2) used surveys, questionnaires, video recordings and interviews as well. In most of the studies, authors created self-developed interviews and questionnaires where validity was not established. In addition to these data collection methods, both types of studies used class observations to gather all the data.

The majority of studies (n = 16) collected the data from education contexts where there is a focus on settlement and integration for immigrants and refugees. Only four studies included participants who were not studying in the adult language learning classrooms or at community-based settlement services (Roy, 2015; Bhatia and Ritchie, 2016; Capstick, 2019; Morita-Mullaney et al., 2019). These studies focus on the literacy practices of adult migrants before and after the migration process (Capstick, 2019), emerging forms of multiliteracy in rural contexts (Bhatia and Ritchie, 2016) and family-based literacy practices (Roy, 2015; Morita-Mullaney et al., 2019). A few studies (n = 2) focused on the professional development for in-service teachers (Bataller and Reyes, 2019; Holloway, 2020) and, of all of them, only 2 studies analyzed family-based literacy practices (Roy, 2015; Morita-Mullaney et al., 2019).

From a geographic perspective, almost more than a half of the studies were conducted in North America (n = 11) and among those, 6 studies in United States and 5 in Canada. Outside North America, studies were also conducted in Europe (n = 3), United Kingdom (n = 2), Asia (n = 3) and Oceania (n = 1). Data collection from participants was gathered in Spain (Bataller and Reyes, 2019); India (Bhatia and Ritchie, 2016); Timor-Leste (Boon, 2013; Boon et al., 2020); Canada (Holloway, 2020; Holloway and Gouthro, 2020), Syria, Iraq, Colombia, Venezuela, China and Burundi (Burgess, 2020; Burgess and Rowsell, 2020); Pakistan (Capstick, 2019); Burkina Faso, Gambia, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Mali, Nigeria, Senegal (D’Agostino and Mocciaro, 2021); Afghanistan, Bosnia, Ethiopia, Iran, Somalia, Syria (Gyne, 2019); Syria (Kaur, 2016); Somalia and Ethiopia (King et al., 2017); Guatemala and Myanmar (Morita-Mullaney et al., 2019); Mexico (Noguerón-Liu and Hogan, 2017); Somalia and Kenya (Roy, 2015); India (Simpson, 2013); China (Tan, 2020); and Iran and Afghanistan (Thériault, 2019).

Studies contextualized their research within a variety of conceptual topics related to adult multiliteracies. Most of them align with the use of multiliteracies in adult classrooms (n = 10). Others relied on professional development for teachers (n = 2), family-based literacy practices (n = 2), literacy and identity aligned in multiliteracy practices (n = 2), affectivity in the pedagogy of multiliteracies (n = 2) and translanguaging as a pedagogical practice in adult education (n = 2).

5.1. The conceptualisation of Multiliteracies revisited

The diversity of topics that covers the “multiliteracies approach” makes it interesting to summarize the types of literacies that all these studies analyze, as well as the kinds of institutions that take advantage of the multiliteracy pedagogy. Several studies explored the benefits of the approach of multiliteracies in real practice in adult literacy education. Qualitative studies suggested that the use of the multiliteracies pedagogy is related to the success of the adult learners in class (Bhatia and Ritchie, 2016; Boon, 2013; D’Agostino and Mocciaro, 2021; Holloway and Gouthro, 2020; Kaur, 2016; King et al., 2017; Noguerón-Liu and Hogan, 2017; and Tan, 2020). Holloway and Gouthro (2020) found that there are many benefits to the multiliteracies approach for adult learners, given the increasing need to pay attention to learning issues related to lifelong learning, opportunities for engagement for learners of English-as-an-additional language, new technologies and social justice. They showed the multiliteracies approach as an expansive form of literacy that includes multimodalities and helps learners to adapt to different realities in workforce, community, and cultural contexts. Noguerón-Liu and Hogan (2017) reflect on the important use of multimodal resources for adult and young migrants in order to symbolize the transnational knowledge that they already bring to the new contexts. The connection between the digital sources and the implications for pedagogical practices are defined as the key to success.

Mixed-methods studies (Boon et al., 2020; and Jacobs et al., 2014) also reported on the advantages of the multiliteracy approach and the implications for the success of adult migrant learners. Boon et al. (2020) concluded that experiencing classroom talks that include adult learners’ different languages and accept multilingual interactions impact positively on students’ learning process. Jacobs et al. (2014) analysed data from adults using a self-access online learning system and report that tutor-facilitated digital literacy acquisition is highly relevant to help this population.

According to the different types of literacies that the studies analyzed, D’Agostino and Mocciaro (2021) examined the multilingual writing on Facebook of adult plurilingual migrants. They found that the multiliteracy approach show for the emergence of learning strategies that reflect a real autonomous learning experience. Tan (2020) also explored how adult learners use different ways of meaning-making through the multimodalities in a foreign language context. Her analysis shows vlogs as digitally mediated literacy practices that implies the knowledge of a repertoire of semiotic resources. Bhatia and Ritchie (2016) examined different emerging forms of multiliteracy and multilingualism in adult learners in rural areas in their everyday lives. They report that these emerging forms of multiliteracy occur through the development of digital media literacies. In the same way, Kaur (2016) anticipated that engagement with literacy practices happen in everyday contexts. In the cases of refugees, literacy practices change due to changing demands or are influenced by personal experiences. This study shows the importance of online writing spaces and its possibilities of offering multilingual texts. Also Noguerón-Liu and Hogan (2017) found that the transmission of transnational and social knowledge happens because of the importance of language and literacy practices. They paid attention to the implementation of activities that support the connection of communities across nations. They emphasized the circulation of literacies and the uses of media in different contexts.
Although a great number of studies refer to digital literacy and multimodality, family-based literacy practices are analyzed as well. Only two studies (Roy, 2015; Morita-Mullaney et al., 2019) point to the relevance of taking into consideration the daily literacy practices that occur in familiar context. Roy (2015) explored the intersections between linguistic and cultural identities and how the use of the language at home can help educators to understand and share student’s migration experiences. Morita-Mullaney et al. (2019) examined how the family-based literacy practices exhibit multilingual multiliteracies. They argued that educators should consider in their daily teaching experiences a pedagogy of multiliteracies that departs from the conventional definitions of literacy teaching by recognizing multimodal communication and multilingual multiliteracies of families. Home and community-based multiliteracies have to be considered as available and generated resources. The use of multiliteracy approach in class combined with the use of the language in the homes of the immigrants reflects a critical stance by embedding the social, cultural and linguistic students’ background. All these studies reflect innovative ways of practicing language and literacy and call the attention of teachers for the urge of finding new spaces for students to explore how to approach literacy outside the classroom and in informal contexts.

The prevalence of the kinds of institutions that take advantage of multiliteracy pedagogy has also been studied in a broad manner. The majority of studies (Bhatia and Ritchie, 2016; Boon, 2013; Boon et al., 2020; Burgess, 2020; Burgess and Rowsell, 2020; Capstick, 2019; D’Agostino and Mocciaro, 2021; Gynne, 2019; Holloway, 2020; Holloway and Gouthro, 2020; Kaur, 2016; King et al., 2017; Morita-Mullaney et al., 2019; Noguerón-Liu and Hogan, 2017; Roy, 2015; Simpson, 2013; Thériault, 2019) have suggested that adult literacy classes happen in informal settings of education. All these studies agree that non-formal settings and community-based organizations provide a positive space for literacy learning for the population addressed. These institutions promote activities based on migrants’ lives and experiences to foster autonomy and confidence accepting their multilingualism and using a variety of multimodal resources. In all of the sections of education, the focus is the multilingual context. All adult learners are migrants and most of them multilingual. The multiliteracy approach in these non-formal institutions facilitates different ways in which language is used in a dynamic setting in adult literacy classes. The nature of these institutions creates an atmosphere where teachers and adult students can negotiate language policy, so teachers and students draw on the language resources that they have in their communicative repertoires. This scenario provides a space for a more pragmatic use of the language where teachers and students collaborate with a variety of language resources for meaning-making in class.

5.2. Outcomes of the multiliteracy approach with adult learners

Several are the affordances of the multiliteracy approach with language learners as regards language(s) used in the classroom, learners’ needs and agency, technologies used, adults’ socio-emotional needs and teachers’ professional development.

Among the most important outcomes of all the studies considered in this review, there are two main aspects particularly relevant: the analysis of learners’ native language use and their translanguaging practices. Gynne (2019) explored the everyday multilingual languaging among participants and reflected upon the implementation process of translanguaging as a pedagogical practice. She concludes that teachers drawing deliberately on their students’
multiple linguistic resources makes some students act as mediators and enhances all students’ learning. Translanguaging practices in the class evolved to new forms of pedagogies that scaffold the learning process for emergent multilinguals. Capstick (2019) also analyzed how literacy in different languages interacts before and after the process of migration. He observed that multilingual migrants get access to new forms of literacies through their existing literacy practices. These new literacies are the result of the continuation of the original literacies deployed in formal and informal settings. All these studies show that the use of native languages and translanguaging practices are seen as a necessary pedagogical practices and tools for the success in adult education.

A second outcome is that most of the research on multiliteracy focuses on learners’ needs and on their agency, showing that it is less important to focus on L2 instruction. The general aim is to take into consideration and care about students’ experiences and identities. In this sense, the use of artifacts allows adult learners to try out different identities that shape the way they perceive themselves, making an influence in their literacy practices (Simpson, 2013; Thériault, 2019).

Some studies also considered the impact of new technologies in the multiliteracy classes. Simpson (2013) observed that new technologies reproduce established classroom hierarchies despite the fact that they offer a chance to develop different identity positions. The majority of the studies (Bhatia and Ritchie, 2016; Boon, 2013; Boon et al., 2020; Burgess, 2020; Burgess and Rowsell, 2020; Capstick, 2019; D’Agostino and Mocciaro, 2021; Gyne, 2019; Holloway, 2020; Holloway and Gouthro, 2020; Kaur, 2016; King et al., 2017; Morita-Mullaney et al., 2019; Noguerón-Liu and Hogan, 2017; Roy, 2015; Thériault, 2019), on the contrary, found that the use of new technologies can help adult learners in a foreign-language context to develop new required skills for multimodal texts. These multimodal and digital practices should be seen as innovative ways of practicing language and literacy in non-instructional or formal contexts of education.

A third relevant outcome is related to the emotional part of multiliteracies. A few studies discussed specifically the role of affect in adult learners. Burgess and Rowsell (2020) recommend the use of affective activities in groups of refugees. Results showed that the use of different affective multimodal materials is beneficial for adult migrants that abandoned their homelands. Burgess (2020) also analysed the disruptive moments of a multiliteracies English-as-an-Additional Language (EAL) classroom with young adult students. She observes that the emotional energy of learners, what goes on inside and between the learners (Stevick, 1980), influences their learning. She states in her study that the self-exploration of multiliteracies teaching practices reflects a process engaged with affect theory and proposes to pay attention to students’ histories, memories, and sensations to enrich meaning making. King et al. (2017) adds that learners, even with only emergent print literacy, need cognitively challenging or socially rewarding tasks to avoid routine and promote active engagement.

Finally, several studies reported on the absence of appropriate professional development for teachers. Bataller & Reyes (2019) observed that pre-service teachers recognized the importance of being trained by the multiliteracies approach while Holloway & Gouthro (2020) analyzed adult educators’ and secondary school teachers’ choices in framing their learning. In order to help adults to become active citizens in charge of their changes in their own lives, Holloway & Gouthro (2020) recommend experiential learning with hands-on experiences, competence-based tasks, modality combination as it enhances adult learning opportunities,
inclusion of the language of students’ home community, development of learners’ digital literacy and acknowledgment of students’ culture and semiotics to enhance social justice. According to them, all these develop in a teaching practice that reflects the incorporation of the pedagogy of multiliteracies.

6. CONCLUSION

Many are the benefits of the multiliteracies approach in adult education that have been explored in all the studies we have reviewed, but their qualitative, explorative and diverse nature makes it difficult to infer its precise impact in adult language learning. From a pedagogical perspective, multiliteracies in adult education still stays as an emergent field that claims for further studies where mixed methods studies are of relevance, but many affordances are constantly mentioned.

As a general answer to what the best language teaching practices are for at-risk learners, studies clearly confirm the need of action-oriented experiences, where experiential learning, hands-on experiences and the combination of modality (digital, musical, visual, drama…) are included. These best practices seem to enhance adult learning opportunities. Furthermore, teachers who acknowledge adult learners’ cultural and linguistic diversity allowing translanguaging, multilingual interactions, in their classes help students to feel more involved in language learning and to feel their uniqueness confirmed by others. The inclusion of tasks where migrants share their own cultural references and traditions can be useful. Also, short texts or audiovisual materials that suggest several alternatives to solve problems migrants may face in the new country (opening a bank account, visiting the doctor, etc.) are reported as convenient. In fact, resilience is a common factor when describing adult language learning experiences, especially when migrants are the participants. All members of the adult class may benefit from the transnational knowledge that migrants bring with them. This capacity of overcoming difficulties can be increased when adults know the availability of social resources and when the sense of belonging to a learning community is developed.

However, an adult learner-centered perspective seems still underdeveloped. In many cases materials used in the learning-to-read classroom are childish and many adult language programs forget one of the literacies most needed by migrants: the occupational literacy. Therefore, future research is very much needed. A framework including all types of literacies, connecting multimodality to multilingualism, acculturation and socio-emotional features is required to better understand the language acquisition process of adult learners.
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