

Daukšaitė-Kolpakovienė, A., Misevičiūtė, V. & Ringailienė, T. (2026). Embracing Multimodal Resources in Teaching English and Other Languages at a HE Institution. *Revista Electrónica Interuniversitaria de Formación del Profesorado*, 29(2), 31-44.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.6018/reifop.715971>

Embracing Multimodal Resources in Teaching English and Other Languages at a HE Institution

Aurelija Daukšaitė-Kolpakovienė, Vaida Misevičiūtė, Teresė Ringailienė

Vytautas Magnus University

Abstract

Although multimodality is not a novel concept in language teaching, its strategic application continues to evolve and expand. The study intends to extend the current body of literature on multimodality in language teaching by focusing on the strategic use of multimodal resources for teaching English (as an L2) and other foreign languages (as L3 and/or L4) through the lens of teachers' beliefs about their value in teaching a certain skill. An anonymous questionnaire, featuring both open-ended and closed-ended questions, alongside semi-structured interviews, was used to investigate the strategic utilization of multimodal resources among two groups of language educators at a public university in Lithuania. The study aims to explore the following: which multimodal resources the two groups use, what criteria the teachers set to select those resources, what objectives the resources help to achieve while teaching linguistic skills and competences, and what benefits and potential drawbacks they can identify based on their experience. Naturally, a comparative approach is employed to explore similarities and differences regarding pedagogical opportunities and implications that the use of visual, auditory, digital, and /or other multimodal resources brings to students and educators in a foreign language classroom.

Key words

Higher education; multimodality; L2, L3; language teaching.

Contact:

Teresė Ringailienė, terese.ringailiene@vdu.lt, K. Donelaičio Str. 52-309, 51469 Kaunas, Lithuania

Aprovechamiento de los recursos multimodales en la enseñanza del inglés y otros idiomas en una institución de educación superior

Resumen

Si bien la multimodalidad no constituye un fenómeno novedoso en el ámbito de la enseñanza de idiomas, su aplicación estratégica continúa evolucionando y expandiéndose. El propósito de este estudio es ampliar la literatura existente sobre multimodalidad en la enseñanza de idiomas. Para ello, se centra en el uso estratégico de recursos multimodales para la enseñanza del inglés (como L2) y otras lenguas extranjeras (como L3 y/o L4). Este análisis se realiza desde la perspectiva de las creencias del profesorado sobre el valor de dichos recursos en la enseñanza de una determinada habilidad. Para ello, se implementó un cuestionario anónimo, compuesto por preguntas abiertas y cerradas, complementado con entrevistas semiestructuradas. Este enfoque metodológico permitió investigar el uso estratégico de recursos multimodales entre dos grupos de profesores de idiomas de una universidad pública de Lituania. El propósito de este estudio es examinar los recursos multimodales empleados por ambos grupos, los criterios que los profesores emplean para seleccionarlos, los objetivos que estos recursos contribuyen a alcanzar en la enseñanza de habilidades y competencias lingüísticas, así como los beneficios y posibles inconvenientes que pueden identificar según su experiencia. En este sentido, se ha empleado un enfoque comparativo para explorar tanto las similitudes como las diferencias en cuanto a las oportunidades pedagógicas y las implicaciones que la utilización de recursos visuales, auditivos, digitales y otros recursos multimodales conlleva para los estudiantes y educadores en el contexto de un aula de lengua extranjera.

Palabras clave

Educación superior; multimodalidad; L2, L3; enseñanza de idiomas.

Introduction

In the last two decades, multimodality has been widely researched (Bezemer & Jewitt, 2018; Kessler, 2022), and multimodal teaching has been reported to have numerous benefits for both teachers and students (Choi & Yi, 2015; Lim & Polio, 2020), especially in language-related contexts. However, many such studies focus on students rather than their teachers. This results in limited insight into how teachers employ multimodal resources (Choi & Yi, 2015) to teach linguistic skills and competences in L2, L3, or L4 classrooms. To fill this gap, the present research explores the implementation of various modes in higher education in Lithuania with respect to two teacher groups: those who teach English as a foreign language and those who teach other languages (such as Spanish, French, Italian, German, etc.). Accordingly, this study seeks to answer the following research questions:

- RQ1. Which multimodal resources do the two groups use?
- RQ2. What criteria do the teachers set to select those resources?
- RQ3. What objectives do the resources help to achieve while teaching linguistic skills and competences?
- RQ4. What benefits and potential drawbacks can the two groups identify based on their experience?

The present study seeks to contribute to and expand the current literature on multimodality in language teaching by focusing on the strategic use of multimodal resources for teaching

English (as L2) and other foreign languages (as L3 and/or L4) through the lens of teachers' beliefs about their value in teaching a certain skill. The authors of the study hypothesize that the use of (and/or the variety of) multimodal resources the teachers choose might be predetermined by the language and the level that is taught and the classroom mode (traditional, blended, or online) in which it is taught; however, a preference for digital resources would be exhibited. The concept of multimodality and prior studies on multimodality in language teaching will be discussed first.

Multimodality: what it is

Even though various modes are omnipresent in daily life, media, education, and other fields, the term “multimodality” appeared in the 1990s to refer to meaning making and communication through various combined means (Kress, 1994; Bezemer & Jewitt, 2018). Currently, there is no consistency in terminology to name these means because various linguistic (and non-linguistic) branches can use different ones for example, multimodal “modes,” “modalities,” or “semiotic resources” (Bezemer & Jewitt, 2018). It is also important that multimodality can vary in its focus; for instance, focus on the use of technologies (Bezemer & Jewitt, 2018). In the traditional understanding, language was seen as the best means to achieve communicative aims. Now different modes are seen as having their potential and advantages in the meaning-making possibilities (Bezemer & Jewitt, 2018). Bezemer and Jewitt (2018) formulated the following premises of multimodality:

- “1. Meaning is made with different semiotic resources, each offering distinct potentialities and limitations;
2. Meaning making involves the production of multimodal wholes;
3. If we want to study meaning, we need to attend to all semiotic resources being used to make a complete whole.” (Bezemer & Jewitt, 2018, p. 2)

Kress, a leading scholar in the field, discussed the combination of several modes in educational settings, emphasizing the need for multimodal literacy and the variety and combination of modes in teaching and learning situations (Kress, 1997; Kress et al. 2001). In the second language (L2) research, Tardy (2005) was among the earliest scholars to address the need for multimodal teaching. A significant contribution by Grapin (2019) pointed to strong and weak multimodality, a distinction that helps clarify how teachers integrate modes in practice. In the weak version, non-linguistic modes (e.g., visuals, graphs, audio) serve as temporary scaffolds that support learners' language processing and remain aids only until learners develop sufficient proficiency. Conversely, the strong version of multimodality uses different modes for meaning construction. Multimodality is often associated with academic content classes, and, as Grapin (2019) noted, the weak version of multimodality dominates L2 teaching, a tendency that researchers argue deprives learners from fuller engagement in a rich linguistic environment due to limited exposure to strong version of multimodality (Valdés, 2017).

On the positive side, Kessler (2022) argued that as contemporary teaching heavily relies on technologies, teachers may not even be aware of how many different modalities they employ in their teaching. Kessler (2022) exemplified this by noting that students are almost routinely asked to create slide show presentations. To communicate ideas effectively, they need to manipulate multiple meaning-making modes—written language, visual imagery, audio elements, gestures, and facial expressions, as well as spatial arrangement. Furthermore, the researcher highlighted the importance of purposeful and careful integration of multiple modes with a specific objective in mind (Kessler, 2022; Fernández-Costales et al., 2024). In a language classroom, the objectives may be related to linguistic skills and competences as well as 21st century skills, such as creativity (Masinde et al., 2023), cultural immersion (Benjamin et al., 2020), or critical thinking, reflection, and collaboration (Miki, 2020). At the

same time, they can cater for learners of varied learning styles (Masinde et al., 2023) and make the learning content more engaging (Aguilera-Fuentes & Ortiz-Navarrete, 2025).

In this study, multimodal resources were explained as various non-linguistic (audio, visual, spacial, or kinaesthetic) resources outside of textbook resources. In terms of their use, teachers may pursue multiple aims simultaneously; for example, multimodal input may be “audiovisual input (dynamic imagery + auditory input) or reading-while-listening activities, which consist of written texts that are presented simultaneously with the corresponding audio” (Cárdenas-Claros et al., 2023, 1). Usually, language learners move fluidly across various modes (Grapin & Llosa, 2020). On the other hand, multimodal teaching is highly context-dependent (Choi & Yi, 2015; Grapin & Llosa, 2020); therefore, researchers identify a range of factors that shape teachers’ use of multimodal input, including the use of L1 and others, technical problems (teachers’ digital skills, internet connection), time constraints, fear of change, and multimodal literacy. Despite the possible issues and challenges, language teachers often have a positive attitude towards multimodal teaching (Miki, 2020).

Findings from other studies on multimodality in language teaching

Regarding research on multimodality in language classrooms, EFL multimodal writing (rather than other skills and/ or languages) has mostly been studied (e.g. Archer, 2022; Grapin & Llosa, 2020; Hafner, 2015; Lim & Polio, 2020; Zeng, 2024). However, recent studies moved beyond document analysis and engaged in class observations or experimental interventions. Several research focuses will be indicated in this section to place the current study in its context.

One significant focus of multimodal research emphasizes how different modes contribute to improved language skills. Drawing on an online classroom setup and two English teachers’ self-reports, Choi & Yi (2015) analyzed how multimodal material supported student learning. Illustrations and digitalized vocabulary resources, for example, were found to help low-proficiency learners with text comprehension while multimodal projects boosted self-expression. Yan-Li & Yu-Nan (2017) conducted an experiment with two groups of advanced English learners in China and found that the group engaged in multimodal listening tasks significantly improved their listening and overall language skills. Al Bukhari and Dewey (2023) reported how the use of multimodal glosses (texts with pictures) in teaching Arabic (as L2) vocabulary at the university level turned out to be more beneficial in terms of recognition and recall of Arabic vocabulary than using only a text or only a picture (one mode). Ho & Feng (2022) concluded that studying English through YouTube videos, which are multimodal in themselves (text, speech, visuals, gestures) work effectively together to create meaning. Masinde et al. (2023), in the context of teaching English in primary schools in Kenya, demonstrated that combination of modes leads to improvement in listening and speaking skills. Carcamo & Pino (2025) noted significant enhancement in reading comprehension when infographics were used with A2 university students learning English. Archer (2022) concluded that digital visuals helped to teach EAP writing in multilingual classrooms in South Africa.

Another focus of multimodal research addresses non-linguistic benefits. Benjamin et al. (2020) reported that authentic music video advertisement(s) in addition to spoken language in German L2 university classes (in the USA) helped teach German culture. Archer (2022) also found videos to be useful in south African context. A study with pre-service teachers (Miki, 2020) at one Indonesian university underscored the use of technology for students’ critical thinking, reflection, collaboration, learning management, and knowledge building. Choi & Yi (2015) stressed the importance of production and not mere consumption of multimodal resources to enhance students’ self-confidence, self-esteem and engagement. Septianing Putri et al. (2024) presented Indonesian EFL teachers’ perspectives on how their use of

certain modes in their teaching practice benefited learners with specific learning styles. Tailoring activities for student needs (pictures, diagrams for visual learners or interactive activities and digital resources for kinesthetic learners) had a positive effect on learner active participation. Aguilera-Fuentes and Ortiz-Navarrete (2025) found that a multimodal screencast feedback strategy with undergraduate students learning English at a Chilean university was viewed as more engaging, useful, and clearer than traditional written feedback.

Methodology

Participants

4 English teachers (further referred to as TEFL) and 16 teachers of other foreign languages (further referred to as TOFL) (N=30) employed at a higher education institution in Lithuania participated in the study, representing 55.5% of the 54 foreign-language teachers employed during the autumn semester, 2025. Convenience sampling was used to recruit them to be able to collect the two groups of participants of similar sizes to fill in a questionnaire. At the targeted university, English as a foreign language is an obligatory study subject until advanced-level competence is achieved. More than 30 other non-obligatory languages are also taught at the institution intermittently based on student demand. Through volunteer sampling, five additional teachers participated in the study as interviewees. Thus, the total number of participants was 35.

Data collection instrument

An online questionnaire (containing 15 closed-ended and 10 open-ended questions) was created and distributed via email. The questionnaire included questions on the demographic information of the participants, use of multimodal resources in addition to textbooks (e.g. what resources are used for the development of language skills or the reasons of using them), selection criteria, objectives, and benefits and drawbacks of the multimodal resources. In addition, individual semi-structured interviews were conducted with 5 language teachers of various languages, with each interview lasting for 50 - 60 minutes on average. Interviews were conducted to deepen the interpretation of the questionnaire results and triangulate the data. Moreover, based on the literature review, it is possible to claim that there is a lack of mixed method studies in multimodal teaching (Kessler, 2022); therefore, this paper attempts to narrow this gap.

Procedure

Data were collected via an email invitation to complete a Google Forms questionnaire in late November–December 2025. Participation was voluntary and anonymous. Before the data collection through the questionnaire, semi-structured interviews had been conducted on MS Teams with five volunteer teachers of various foreign languages in English or Lithuanian. MS Teams instant written transcript was applied, and Lithuanian transcripts were later translated into English with the help of DeepL, an AI-based translation tool. The participants who were interviewed did not fill in the questionnaire to avoid data overlapping.

Methods of analysis

Quantitative (MS Excel) and qualitative (thematic and descriptive analysis based on Nowell et al., 2017) methods were utilized to approach the collected data with respect to the set research questions. The latter involved careful reading of provided answers (in both the questionnaire and interviews), identification of key words and salient themes, grouping based on manual answer coding, and synthesis of the themes into broader ones. A comparative approach was employed to explore pedagogical opportunities and implications

that the use of multimodal resources brings to students and educators in a foreign language classroom. Thus, the present investigation reflects a mixed-methods research design.

Results and Discussion

There are several important considerations that need to be addressed while analyzing demographic data. All the TEFL group teachers have been teaching English from 15 to 26 years (among which 71.4% MA and 28.6% PhD); on the other hand, in the TOFL group, 43.5% of the teachers have been teaching for more than 15 years and 56.5% had 5-15 years of experience (among which 43.8% PhD, 56.2% MA). The observed tendency is that the TEFL group teaches high proficiency level classes while the TOFL group mostly teaches low proficiency level classes (A1-A2). This is related to the fact that the university's study regulations require its students to acquire C1/C2 level English proficiency, and many students already have sufficiently high English skills acquired before their enrolment into the university, whereas other languages, especially those that are not taught at schools in Lithuania, are usually started from the basic level. Taking this into account, the collected data are not surprising and reflect the background and context of the study. The TEFL group taught the following proficiency levels: A1-21.4%, A2 – 28.6%, B1 – 50%, B2 – 78.6%, and C1/C2 – 92.9% while the TOFL group: A1 – 100%, A2 – 75%, B1 (B1.1 and B1.2) – 50%, B2 – 31.3%, and C1 – 25%. Since one teacher can teach several levels, the percentage presented does not equal 100.

Finally, the TEFL group mostly taught in both online and face-to-face mode (85.7%), and only 14.3% taught their language classes face-to-face. Similarly, TOFL is mostly taught in both modes (62.4%), but in this group, 18.8% were taught only face-to-face and some teachers taught only online (18.8%).

Having established the teaching context, the questionnaire proceeded to analyze the use of multimodal resources by the two teacher groups (RQ1). The teachers were provided with the definition of multimodality and asked about the frequency of use of such resources in addition to class textbooks. Overall, 64.3% of the TEFL and 75% of TOFL group used multimodal resources often, while 21.4% and 25% respectively indicated using them in every class. There were no teachers who would admit to never using such resources, but 14.3% of the TEFL group used them rarely (no such responses in the TOFL group). This finding is consistent with Tardy (2005), Hafner (2015), and Kessler (2022) who observed that school-based tasks have become increasingly multimodal.

The study hypothesized that the teachers in both groups would opt for digital resources. However, the data showed a different view. Only 21.4% of TEFL and 31.3% of the TOFL group indicated that all their multimodal resources were digital. 35.7% in TEFL and 56.3% in TOFL group employed many multimodal resources and 42.9% and 12.4% respectively used some. There were no participants in either group who reported using none of the digital resources. Such surprisingly low reliance on digital resources may be explained by Kessler's (2022) findings that contemporary teaching so heavily relies on technologies that teachers may not even be aware of how many different modalities they employ in their teaching. The findings of the present research were triangulated across data sources: both the interviews and the open-ended questionnaire responses consistently indicated that online teachers relied exclusively on digital resources, with frequent references to YouTube, TED Talks, videos, audio recordings, podcasts, and online platforms. Similarly, in face-to-face classrooms, teachers reported using real-world materials such as songs, interviews, or films, which were likewise predominantly delivered in digital format.

Across language skills (listening, reading, writing, speaking, grammar, vocabulary, mediation, and interaction), it is possible to claim that overall, both groups used a variety of traditional and digital resources very creatively to enhance student learning. Both groups relied on authentic informational (e.g. articles, menus), literary (e.g. poems), and functional texts (e.g. advertisements), or videos rather than simplified or adapted samples. Both teacher groups prioritized communicative language teaching and highlighted interactive speaking, listening, and writing activities. In both the questionnaire and interviews, the teachers demonstrated the use of various institutional (e.g. France24, TV5 Monde, King Sejong Institute, BBC Learning English, British Council Learn English) or interactional resources (e.g. Wannalish, Tubequizard, Padlet, Moodle interactive tools, gaming tools, or Wordwall, Duolingo, Thinglink, iSLCollective to name a few).

The comparative analysis of different skills made it possible to identify some patterns emerging across the two groups. The TEFL group tended to use multimodal resources as enrichment tools, combining visual and auditory input to foster lexical refinement and more nuanced meaning-making among higher-proficiency learners. In contrast, the TOFL group adopted a more selective and audio-focused approach, primarily aimed at scaffolding basic comprehension and managing cognitive load at lower proficiency levels. This contrast highlights the importance of tailoring multimodal design to learners' developmental stages and cognitive readiness, as anticipated in the study's hypotheses.

As indicated by both the questionnaire and interviews, the TEFL group showed a higher level of experimentation, or rather, pedagogical creativity, as they employed digital or AI-generated content (for writing (e.g. Grammarly, QuillBot, WordTune, Plot Generator, and ChatGPT), reading (e.g. Diffit, Nolej, and Immersive Reader), listening, pronunciation, and speaking (e.g. Elsa Speak, YouGlish, Gliglish, Forvo, Eleven Labs, Natural Reader, and Mizou)) while the TOFL group utilized more teacher created materials and explanations or traditional resources (such as Audacity for recordings, PowerPoint for presentations, or Shutterfly for vocabulary pictures). This might be attributed to the dominance of English in the online educational market, which offers a wider range of ready-made multimodal materials. Although many resources cited by the TEFL group support multiple languages, they were seldom used by the TOFL group, likely because platforms that claim multilingual functionality are still largely optimized for English. Therefore, the TOFL group clearly demonstrated more creativity through multimodal resources as they used color-coded handouts, teacher-made dialogues, peer-generated materials, and even community-based encounters to enhance student learning.

Another important observation is that teachers often observed a multi-purpose use of multimodal resources. For example, several interviewees indicated using interactive and gamified platforms, such as Kahoot, Goosechase, or Mentimeter for more than one linguistic skill or competence: "Wordwall. There I created a Wordwall for everyone; the textbook is absolutely insufficient, for, let's say, vocabulary and grammar. So I created a lot of additional tasks on Wordwall. And I also use Wordwall for speaking. For example, I transfer all the speaking or logical thinking tasks there as well" (Interviewee 3). Such purposeful combination of various modes was noticed in the interviews only and was similarly identified by Masinde et al. (2023) and Cárdenas-Claros et al. (2023) as a factor leading to student skill improvement.

Finally, a substantial discrepancy in the use of skills may be observed with mediation. The questionnaire results showed equal use of written texts, audio, and video materials along with digital resources, such as ChatGPT, Padlet, and PowerPoint as potentially useful for mediation-related activities. However, it became clear that the teachers of English had a better understanding of mediation based on the CEFR as in the questionnaire they explicitly

mentioned mediation activities (e.g. summarizing, paraphrasing, or text simplification) using various modalities while the TOFL group demonstrated limited implementation, even a lack of understanding of the concept: “I don’t understand what mediation exactly is”; “Don’t do mediation (hardly ever).” Therefore, if the TOFL group applied mediation, they usually focused on oral and interpersonal mediation, whereas the TEFL group focused on text mediation (summarizing/paraphrasing), multimodal mediation (chats/diagrams), and collaborative mediation (Padlet/Miro/ Canva).

The questionnaire also attempted to clarify the reasons for using multimodal resources. The answers showed a great contrast between the two groups. The TEFL group employed multimodal resources to enhance classroom entertainment (92.9%), promote comprehension (78.6%), foster deeper engagement (64.3%), and support diverse learning styles (50%). This compares with much higher numbers among the TOFL group who, with the help of multimodal resources, sought to promote comprehension (87.5%), foster deeper engagement (75%), enhance classroom entertainment (75%) and support diverse learning styles (75%). The latter finding was also prominent in some prior studies, such as Septianing Putri et al. (2024) or Öksüz Zerey (2025) where teachers indicated engagement as an important reason for using multimodal resources.

Furthermore, it is important to discuss the criteria that influence the choice of multimodal resources (RQ2). The two teacher groups demonstrated slightly different results. For the TEFL group, the most important criterion was relevance to learning objectives (85.7%), while for TOFL, it was student interests (75%). It is evident that the TEFL group focused on the practical aspects of the resources: ease of use (64.3%), accessibility, and interactivity (57.1% each), while the top criteria for the TOFL group were relevance to learning objectives, student engagement, interactivity, and student proficiency level (68.8% each). Other student-centered criteria, such as students’ learning styles and students’ needs also scored high in this group (56.3%). On the other hand, these criteria were marked by less than half of the respondents (42.9%) in the TEFL group. Broader generalizations cannot be made, but it seems likely that the TOFL group prioritized students’ needs, interests, and engagement, whereas the TEFL group tended to consider the practical aspects of the resources.

75% of the TOFL and a slightly lower percentage (64.3%) of the TEFL admitted that the mode of classes influenced the choice of multimodal resources. The comments on the answer provided some interesting insights and slightly different views between the two groups. The TEFL emphasized the ease of use of various resources in an online setting because students could operate multiple resources simultaneously, or digital resources were often assigned for homework or extra practice. Both groups admitted that online classes required more engaging multimodal activities, but this trend was much more prevalent in the TOFL group: “Online <...> it is difficult to manage learners’ attention;” “it is difficult to reach out each student.” One respondent admitted that s/he preferred to avoid teaching online, while another one highlighted that currently the shift to online teaching was driven by contemporary trends rather than perceived usefulness. As exemplified by these quotations, the TOFL group seemed to be more critical towards online teaching.

On the one hand, this seems to be surprising after the experiences of teaching online during the COVID pandemic. On the other hand, it is not because deeper exposure to online teaching raised the bar for quality control: the teachers want better resources to engage learners who often hide behind anonymity. Contrary to the questionnaire results, the interviewees highlighted teacher adaptability; for example, Interviewee 2 claimed the following: “I do think that the difference exists, and I think that we have to take advantage of the situation that we are in. If it's online, you use more <...> online resources. If you are live, then you make it live.” Additionally, Interviewee 4 emphasized the importance of creativity: “I think that the

teacher can... Or should actually... be creative and trying to use all these resources in different levels, so it's a teacher's job." As exemplified by the quote above, creativity and adaptability are viewed as inseparable parts of a teacher's job. These findings support the initial hypothesis that teaching mode shapes multimodal integration.

Across both groups, teachers selected multimodal resources based on accessibility, alignment with learning outcomes, and student engagement—criteria that echo Miki's (2020) observation that multimodal practice is shaped by both technical and non-technical challenges, including digital skills, connectivity, time constraints, and fear of change. The teachers at the institution under the present investigation reported similar obstacles: technical issues, time constraints, and cognitive overload due to the abundance of digital resources. A closer analysis of the mode of teaching revealed that the TOFL group saw online teaching more as a constraint. More than English teachers, they noted the need to adapt and restructure their multimodal resources and often simplified instruction because physical cues such as gesture, gaze, and movement became irrelevant in the classroom. Teachers noted that while the online environment allowed for more individual interaction, the multimodal resources needed to be more explicit, more structured, and more engaging. In other words, teachers required not only technical skills but also specialized pedagogical knowledge for online instruction to hold effective classes.

The data revealed that both groups tended to use multimodal resources to enhance vocabulary acquisition, listening skills, and grammar understanding. Interestingly, a significantly higher number of TOFL group teachers indicated that they aimed at improving speaking skills using multimodal resources (see Table 1) (RQ3).

Table 1.

Skills intended to be enhanced through multimodal resources

		TEFL	TOFL
Linguistic skills	Vocabulary acquisition	92.9%	93.8%
	Reading comprehension	28.6%	31.3%
	Listening skills	85.7%	81.3%
	Speaking skills	42.9%	56.3%
	Writing skills	42.9%	31.3%
	Grammar understanding	85.7%	62.5%
	Mediation	28.6%	6.3%
	Interaction	28.6%	37.5%
	Non-linguistic skills	Cultural awareness	64.3%
Digital skills		57.1%	18.8%
Creativity		57.1%	56.3%
Interpersonal skills		50%	43.8%
Teamwork		57.1%	37.5%
Problem solving		28.6%	31.3%
Adaptability and flexibility		28.6%	37.5%
Time management		35.7%	18.8%
Leadership		14.3%	6.3%
Critical thinking		64.3%	50%

In addition to language, multimodal resources can improve non-linguistic skills. The answers demonstrated some differences in the attitudes of both groups. The majority of the TOFL group (87.5%) prioritized multimodal resources that support cultural awareness, which was logical in lower-level courses where introducing cultural context was an essential part of language development. In the TEFL group, the priority (64.3%) was given to two categories: cultural awareness and critical thinking, which on the one hand related to the importance of cultural context, and on the **other** one the institutional requirement to reach higher levels (C1/2) of English. Another noticeable trend was related to digital skills: in the TEFL group 57.1% of the teachers considered that the resources improved students' digital skills while this percentage reached only 18.8% in the TOFL group. The skill that, in language teachers' opinion in both groups, was hardly developed by multimodal resources was leadership. One more compelling idea was expressed by Interviewee 5 who viewed the choice of the resources in a broader perspective: "We are teachers, so I guess it's also important to kind of slightly give some, you know, good examples on everything, how to be more civilized, how to be more, I don't know, sustainable, friendly, better person." As the interviewee correctly pointed out, learning a language also enriched and developed the learner's personality; therefore, the choice of the resources may be predetermined not only by the language skills improved but also by their educational value in general and personality development.

Most teachers believed that the multimodal resources they used were effective or very effective: 85.7% in the TEFL group and 93.8% in the TOFL group. In the explanations to the question, the teachers in both groups highlighted that multimodal resources addressed different learning styles, increased motivation, and made the class more engaging, positive, and fun. In addition, the students could use authentic material and improved their intercultural knowledge using various sensory channels and acted in more realistic situations. However, the teachers in both groups also mentioned the substantial amount of time invested in preparation of high-quality and effective resources. Also, TEFL group included the paradox: "They can make the class more engaging; however, they do not necessarily contribute to deep learning and understanding." This might require a more detailed investigation, but the question to what extent being engaged contributes to deep learning and consolidation of knowledge seems to be topical.

The teachers indicated various benefits of multimodal resources (RQ4). For the TEFL group, three aspects seemed to be salient: they increased engagement and motivation and promoted active learning (85.7%) and supported diverse learning styles (71.4%). In addition to the same aspects, the TOFL group also ranked high that they improved comprehension (75%) and encouraged deep understanding (68.8%) while the TEFL group believed that multimodal resources fostered creativity (57.1% compared to 31.3% in the TOFL group) and increased digital literacy skills (35.7% compared to 12.5% in the TOFL group). As exemplified in an interview, "You have to have access to these different types of resources to be able to build the whole picture" (Interviewee 5). This is very much in line with the abundant research on meaning making through different modes: various resources employing various modalities contribute to the learning process.

The teachers also saw some drawbacks (RQ4) of the resources that they used in their classes. For both groups, the most dominant drawback was technical issues (64.3%), while in the TOFL group increased preparation time also scored high (62.5%). English teachers also marked information overload and overreliance on digital formats as important drawbacks (35.7% and 50%, respectively), while the TOFL group did not view them as particularly negative (12.5% and 25%, respectively). Another important difference was unequal computer literacy skills indicated by TEFL (35.7%); in contrast, this aspect did not seem to be problematic for TOFL

(0%). The benefits and drawbacks of multimodal resources indicated by both groups of teachers are presented in Table 2 below:

Table 2.
The benefits and drawbacks of multimodal resources

Benefits	TEFL	TOFL
Support diverse learning styles	71.4%	81.3%
Improve comprehension	42.9%	75%
Increase engagement and motivation	85.7%	81.3%
Increase digital literary skills	35.7%	12.5%
Improve communication skills	50%	43.8%
Encourage deeper understanding	42.9%	68.8%
Foster creativity	57.1%	31.3%
Promote active learning	85.7%	75%
Drawbacks		
Information overload	35.7%	12.5%
Overreliance on digital formats	50%	25%
Increased preparation time	50%	62.5%
Unequal computer literacy skills	35.7%	0
Technical issues	64.3%	62.5%
Reliability of content	50%	50%
Assessment complexity	28.6%	18.8%
Distractions from core learning	35.7%	6.3%
None	7.1%	6.3%

In the interviews, some critical opinions were expressed in addition to the above-mentioned ones: “Young people, they grow up thinking that... It's pressing the button that will solve the problem. Maybe it [the digital format of the resources] takes away some of these natural processes that have to happen dealing with the things, analysing, looking, waiting, having patience” (Interviewee 4).

Thus, according to the teachers, overreliance on digital formats is changing the learning process and may raise false expectations about language learning. The findings of the study showed that teachers of all languages relied heavily on multimodal resources. This is consistent with Tardy (2005), Hafner (2015), and Kessler (2022), who observed that school-based tasks have become increasingly multimodal, requiring learners to coordinate written text, visuals, audio, gesture, and spatial design to communicate effectively. There seems to be consistent criticism in research that the weak version of multimodality remains dominant in foreign language classrooms, depriving students from full engagement to full communicative repertoire and rich linguistic environment (Grapin, 2019; Valdés, 2017). However, a close analysis of the data showed that the study participants used multimodal resources not only to scaffold learning materials but also to support higher-order thinking and conceptual development.

Conclusions

This mixed-method research study offers deeper insights into how language teachers perceive and utilize multimodal resources in instructional contexts.

A wide range of choices of multimodal resources used in teaching languages demonstrates that the teachers of the HE institution employ various modes to achieve their teaching goals. The present research mirrors the wide-spread trend of the abundance of ready-made resources in English; however, TOFL must invest much time and create a large part of the resources *themselves*. Closer collaboration, co-learning, and sharing good practices might facilitate the process of resource development for lesser-taught languages.

The difference in the criteria of choosing multimodal resources has been observed, which is influenced by the offer of the resources on the market: the TEFL group highlights the practical aspect, while the TOFL —their students' needs. To meet them, especially when the ready-made resources are scarce, teachers need not only didactic but also creative, digital, or critical thinking skills. The choice of multimodal resources can also be predetermined by their educational value and the mode in which the classes are taught (face-to-face or online), and ease of use.

The research has revealed that the main linguistic skills enhanced using multimodal resources are vocabulary acquisition, grammar understanding, and listening. This suggests the need for a more integrated pedagogical approach emphasizing deliberate creation of multimodal resources that go beyond pure linguistic skills to foster critical thinking, digital literacy, socio-emotional competencies, and creative and cultural development.

In addition to the obvious benefits of the multimodal resources in the language learning process, digital skills and abilities of learners should be considered, as well as reliability of content should be assessed. From the teacher's perspective, increased preparation time and technological issues were identified as the most significant drawbacks.

The paper provides insights into the current state of the use of multimodal resources in the English and other foreign language classrooms at one Lithuanian university, but future studies could involve multiple institutions. Class observations could also be included, which could be more reliable than self-reported data in the questionnaires.

References

- Aguilera-Fuentes, Y., & Ortiz-Navarrete, M. (2025). Enhancing English speaking skills through screencast feedback: a technique explored with Spanish-speaking undergraduates. *Cogent Education*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2545330>
- Al Bukhari, J., & Dewey, J. A. (2023). Multimodal glosses enhance learning of Arabic vocabulary. *Language Learning & Technology*, 27(1), 1-24. <https://www.lltjournal.org/item/10125-73498/>
- Archer, A. (2022). A multimodal approach to English for academic purposes in contexts of diversity. *World Englishes*, 41(4), 545–553. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12600>
- Benjamin, J. D., Donohue-Bergeler, D., Fuchs, K., & Lorenz, A. (2020). “Is nicht egal:” Guided multimodal reading of a music video advertisement. *Die Unterrichtspraxis*, 53(1), 55–65. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tger.12118>

- Bezemer, J., & Jewitt, C. (2018). Multimodality: A guide for linguists. Manuscript to appear in L. Litosseliti (ed.), *Research Methods in Linguistics* (2nd ed., pp. 1-18). Continuum. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/227335935.pdf>
- Carcamo, B., & Pino, B. (2025). Developing EFL students' multimodal literacy with the use of infographics. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 10(1), Article 16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-025-00322-3>
- Cárdenas-Claros, M. S., Sydorenko, T., Huntley, E., & Montero Perez, M. (2023). Teachers' voices on multimodal input for second or foreign language learning. *Language Teaching Research : LTR*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688231216044>
- Choi, J., & Yi, Y. (2015). Teachers' integration of multimodality into classroom practices for English language learners. *TESOL Journal*, 7(2), 304–327. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.204>
- Fernández Costales, A., Bobadilla Pérez, M., & Lertola, J. (2024). Exploring the Pedagogical Potential of Didactic Audiovisual Translation in Plurilingual Pre-school Education: The Perspective of Pre-service Teachers. *Revista Interuniversitaria De Formación Del Profesorado. Continuación De La Antigua Revista De Escuelas Normales*, 99(38.3). <https://doi.org/10.47553/rifop.v99i38.3.108033>
- Grapin, S. (2019). Multimodality in the new content standards era: Implications for English learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 53(1): 30–55.
- Grapin, S. E., & Llosa, L. (2020). Toward an integrative framework for understanding multimodal L2 writing in the content areas. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 47, 100711. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100711>
- Hafner, C. A. (2015). Remix culture and English language teaching: The expression of learner voice in digital multimodal compositions. *TESOL Quarterly*, 49(3), 486–509. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.238>
- Ho, W. Y. J., & Feng, D. (2022). Orchestrating multimodal resources in English language teaching: a critical study of an online English teaching video. *Pedagogies an International Journal*, 17(4), 368–388. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1554480x.2022.2139257>
- Kress, G. (1994). *Learning to Write*. Second edition. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kress, G. (1997). *Before Writing: Rethinking the Paths to Literacy*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kress, G. et al. (2001). *Multimodal Teaching and Learning: The Rhetorics of the Science Classroom*. London and New York: Continuum.
- Kessler, M. (2022). Multimodality. *ELT Journal*, 76 (4), 551–554. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccaco28>
- Lim, J., & Polio, C. (2020). Multimodal assignments in higher education: Implications for multimodal writing tasks for L2 writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 47, 100713. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100713>
- Masinde, R., Barasa, D., & Mandillah, L. (2023). Effectiveness of using multimodal approaches in teaching and learning listening and speaking skills. *Nairobi Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 7(2), 91-112. <https://doi.org/10.58256/njhs.v7i2.1333>
- Miki, M. H. (2020). Investigating of pre-service teachers' perception and readiness to digital multimodal literacy at Lekidende University. *IJLECR (International Journal of Language Education and Cultural Review)*, 6(1), 62–68. <https://doi.org/10.21009/IJLECR.061.08>

- Nowell, L., S., Norris, J.M., White, D.E., & Moules, N.J. (2017). Thematic analysis. Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 16, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847>
- Öksüz Zerey, M. (2025). Developing AI-supported classroom materials. *Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, 15(2), 140-156. Retrieved from <https://www.jltl.com.tr/index.php/jltl/article/view/872>
- Septianing Putri, Y., Setyaningsih, E., & Adi Putra, K. (2024). Embracing multimodality to teach EFL students: English course teachers' perspectives. *International Journal of Educational Research & Social Sciences*, 5(4), 731-735. <https://doi.org/10.51601/ijersc.v5i4.847>
- Tardy, C. M. (2005). Expressions of disciplinarity and individuality in a multimodal genre. *Computers and Composition*, 22(3), 319-336. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2005.05.004>
- Valdés, G. (2017). Entry visa denied: The construction of symbolic language borders in educational settings. In O. Garcia & N. Flores (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Society* (pp. 321-348). New York, NY: Oxford University Press. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.vdu.lt:2443/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190212896.001.0001>
- Yan-Li, X., & Yu-Nan, L. (2017). An empirical study on the effectiveness and configuration of multimodal college English listening teaching system. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 13(11), 7391. <https://doi.org/10.12973/ejmste/79791>
- Zeng, H. (2024). A Window into Multilingual Students' Worlds: Using Multimodal Writing to Support Writing Growth. *The Reading Teacher*, 78(2), 106-112. <https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.2352>