Behind the concepts of multiliteracies and media literacy in the renewed Finnish core curriculum: A systematic literature review on peer-reviewed research

Lauri Palsa  
PhD student, University of Lapland  
Project Researcher, KAVI

Heli Ruokamo  
Professor, University of Lapland
1. Background of the study
   - Multiliteracies in the renewed Finnish core curriculum (FNBoE 2014)
   - Discussion about the concept of media literacy

2. Methodology

3. Findings
   - Data
   - Multiliteracies: Outcome / Pedagogical approach?
   - Theoretical framework for media literacy
Background of the study

1) Curriculum reform in Finland

- New curriculum is commissioned in 2016 (Basic education)
  - Core curriculum was introduced in 2014
- 7 new transversal competences
  - Including Multiliteracies

2) Conceptual discussion about media literacy

- No consensus about definition (Martens 2010; Potter 2010)
Multiliteracies in Finnish national core curriculum (FNBoE 2014) (1/2)

- Transversal competence (developed in every subject → outcome)

- Based on broad understanding of text
  - Texts are information presented through different symbolic-systems (linguistic, visual, auditve, numeric, kinestetic or mix)
  - Can be interpreted and created in various forms (written, spoken, audiovisual and digital)

- ”Multiliteracies means an ability to acquire, mix, remix, create, present and evaluate information in different forms, different environments, situations and through different tools.”
Multiliteracies (2/2)

- Multiliteracies include different literacies
- Cultural multiliteracies can be enhanced with media education

- Relationship with media literacy?
- Broadness of the concept – Conceptual clarity?
"…’conceptual stretching’ is dangerously conducive to the Hegelian night in which all the cows look black (and eventually the milkman is taken for a cow)…” (Sartori 1970, 1040).

--> A Concept of no difference?
Sartori (1970) Ladders of abstraction

Where the concept applies

Collection of properties
Methodology

- Systematic literature review

- International research articles
  - Multiliteracies and media literacy studies (keywords)
  - Peer-reviewed
  - Published in English
  - Research-articles (Theoretical / Empirical)
  - 2010 – 2014 (Martens 2010; Potter 2010)

- Multidisciplinary databases: [ERIC (ProQuest), Academic Search Elite (Ebsco), ScienceDirect (Elsevier), SpringerLink, SAGE Journals and Emerald Journals]
Search of the studies

Exclusion:
- Duplicates
- Other literature types (For example: columns, reviews, editorials)
- No relevant keywords
- Language

→
- Media literacy articles 188
- Multiliteracies articles 49
Data analysis

- Qualitative content analysis (Finfgeld-Connett 2014; Hsieh & Shannon 2005)
- Sample sizes: 14 for both
- Random sampling (SPSS)
- Focus on the definitions of the concepts and data/methods used in the research
# Findings

- **Methods used in the analyzed articles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Media literacy research</th>
<th>Multiliteracies research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-method</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multiliteracies: Pedagogy

In most articles understood as pedagogical approach
In line with original New London Group article (1996)

"What?"
Available designs
Design
Redesigned

"How?"
Overt instruction
Situated practice
Critical framing
Transformed practice

"We implemented the New London Group’s (Cope and Kalantzis 2000) pedagogy of multiliteracies in 2 year two (14-year-old) English language classrooms, in collaboration with their language arts teacher (Tan and Guo 2009, Tan et al. 2010). The New London Group’s (Cope and Kalantzis 2000) pedagogy of multiliteracies was suitable for the school as it offered a framework for the collaborating teacher to include a range of semiotic modes of meaning making in a wide array of multimodal texts that the students were likely to encounter in their everyday lives.” (Tan & Guo 2013, 31).
“In this study, multiliteracies is used to refer to the ability to interpret and construct different possibilities of meanings made available by differing text-types associated with digital technologies and multimodal texts such as the Internet, video games, digital video, visual images, graphics and layouts.” (Ajayi 2011, 398)

In line with definition in the Finnish core curricula
Media literacy definitions

- Many different definitions → No consensus
  - Differences in the level of precision and in-depth (cf. Ashley et al. 2013; Mizuno, et al. 2010)

- Defined as an outcome (of media education, Chu & Lee 2014)

- Umbrella term, which includes various subsets
  - News media literacy (Ashley et al. 2013)
  - Alcohol and tobacco media literacy (Chang et al. 2014)
  - Public relations literacy (Holladay & Coombs 2013)
### Theoretical framework for media literacies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Abstraction</th>
<th>Media Literacies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Media literacies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Different subsets of media literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Contextualized media literacy definitions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Questioning the endeavor for one universal "fit-for-all" media literacy concept
  → Media literacies
- Different abstraction levels have different roles
  (Theoretical discussion, contextualized research)
- Different subsets (News media literacy, alcohol and tobacco media literacy)
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