Multimodal teaching evaluation with a portfolio in a tertiary education language classroom

María Martínez Lirola[*], University of Alicante, Spain
Department of Linguistics and Modern Languages, University of South Africa (UNISA)

ABSTRACT

Our society has become more technological and multimodal, and consequently teaching has to be adapted to the demands of society. This article analyses the way in which the subject English Language V of the English Studies degree at the University of Alicante combines the development of the five skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing and interacting) evaluated through a portfolio with multimodality in the teaching practices and in each of the activities that are part of the portfolio. The results of a survey prepared at the end of the 2015–16 academic year show the main competences that university students develop thanks to multimodal teaching and the importance of tutorials in this kind of teaching.
Keywords: multimodality; portfolio; information and communication technologies (ICTs); autonomous learning; competences; skills

RESUMEN

Nuestra sociedad es cada vez más tecnológica y multimodal por lo que es necesario que la enseñanza se adapte a los nuevos tiempos. Este artículo analiza el modo en que la asignatura Lengua Inglesa V del grado en Estudios Ingleses de la Universidad de Alicante combina el desarrollo de las cinco destrezas (escucha, habla, lectura, escritura e interacción) evaluadas por medio de un portafolio con la multimodalidad en las prácticas docentes y en cada una de las actividades que componen el portafolio. Los resultados de una encuesta preparada al final del curso académico 2015-2016 ponen de manifiesto las competencias principales que el alumnado universitario desarrolla gracias a la docencia multimodal y la importancia de las tutorías en este tipo de enseñanza.
Palabras clave: multimodalidad; portafolio; tecnologías de la información y la comunicación (TIC); aprendizaje autónomo; competencias; destrezas

---

* Corresponding author; e-mail: maria.lirola@ua.es

IN RECENT YEARS there has been great development in digital and mobile technology. Changes in these new technologies have brought changes in the modes of communication and in the definition of literacy and its applications in the twenty-first century in educational contexts (Lemke, 2012; Livingstone, 2008; Merchant, 2009). In this new context in which everything changes so quickly, some tools of traditional teaching remain. However, new times demand changes in university education, so that learning opportunities offered by new technologies are incorporated into the process of teaching and learning.

Multimodality refers to the use of different modes of communication. Van Leeuwen (2014) defines it in the following way: "The term multimodality refers to the integrated use of different semiotic resources (e.g. language, image, sound and music) in texts and communicative events" (p. 281).

Generally, literacy has focused on the written language; consequently, the other modes of communication (visual, musical, etc.) remained in the background (Coffin, 2012) and were not given much importance. However, many teachers had already incorporated practices or multimodal elements in their teaching intuitively, as stated Knox (2008):

> Multimodal perspectives on language and language education have only recently appeared in the literature on L2 teaching and learning. A brief consideration of the classroom practices of teachers and students shows very quickly, though, that multimodality is something that language teachers have understood intuitively for a long time. (p. 140)

Education in the twenty-first century does not only focus on the use of printed texts to read or write. In this era of literacy, digital emphasis is placed on students to learn through the use of different modes of communication so that they can develop multimodal texts, PowerPoint presentations, creating Web pages, using videos or debates through social networks like Facebook. Following Simpson and Walsh (2010, p. 37): "Now with interactive, multiple authoring and social networking facilities provided by Web 2.0 technologies, new pedagogic possibilities can be utilised in the classrooms."

Consequently, society, because of the changes proposed by the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) and Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) demands new forms of literacy. The use of ICTs facilitates students writing texts through social networks like Facebook or Twitter. In addition, students can use multimodal texts that include images and videos to facilitate their learning process and acquire different skills necessary for the labor market.

The changes demanded by the creation of the EHEA imply a profound restructuring of university teaching so that students and teachers share responsibility in the teaching-learning process (Pereyra-García, Sevilla, & Luzón, 2006; Sánchez, 2006). At university, students are encouraged to become active protagonists in their learning process and acquire core competences that are useful for the labor market (Benito & Cruz, 2005; González & Garcia

Nieto, 2009; López Noguero, 2005; Martínez Lirola, 2007). Consequently, students must be able to apply theory to practice and to see the relationship between what they learn and their future professional life.

Therefore, learning must be progressive, and it is necessary to make explicit the competences that students must acquire with each topic or activity. In fact, choosing formative assessment involves giving importance to independent learning, i.e., university students must take a leading role in the teaching-learning process so that they can easily acquire competences and receive comprehensive training that enables them to be active citizens in society (Hernandez, 2003; Martínez Lirola, 2012; Teichler, 2006; Zabalza, 2002).

In this sense, the portfolio is an evaluation tool that facilitates autonomous learning and makes it possible for students to develop certain competences (McWethy & Gradwell, 1998; O'Malley & Valdez Pierce, 1996; Wright, Knight & Pomerlau, 1999). The different activities that are part of the portfolio have to be selected in order for students to work at their own rhythm to get the competences selected by the teacher and to accomplish the stated objectives, such as the use of different multimodal tools (Apple & Shimo, 2004; Guerrero Cuentas, 2015; Martínez & Rubio, 2009) (see sections 2 and 4 in this article). In the case of languages, students have to work with real language and real texts so that it is easy to establish a relationship between what is learned in the classroom and in life outside (Hall, 2001; O'Keeffe, McCarthy & Carter, 2007).

The changes we have referred to are a challenge for teachers and students because it is necessary to review and develop pedagogy so that ICTs, Facebook, the use of virtual platforms, among others, are incorporated and help the students develop meaningful learning and an effective development of skills and competences. In this sense, all these changes have consequences in pedagogy so that the necessary elements for the production of texts in virtual environments are highlighted (Healy, 2008). The concepts and applications of multiliteracies have spread in recent years thanks to the work of Unsworth (2001, 2008a, 2008b, 2010), Jewitt (2006, 2009), Kress (2009, 2010), among other authors. Their research focuses on how multiliteracies intervene in the classroom, paying particular attention to the way that the relation between text and image and the way in which meanings are constructed according to the way the different modes of communication are combined.

The main objectives of this article are the following: to show the relationship between multimodality in the classroom, evaluation through a portfolio and independent learning and to approach the main competences that students acquire when they are evaluated in this way. In order to accomplish the objectives, we will offer an example of a portfolio that includes multimodal activities. Encouraging multimodal teaching in higher education implies that students are able to create their own work schedule based on their own pace and way of learning. Helping students learn independently and using different multimodal resources means that teachers facilitate students to become aware of the various strategies that can help improve their skills, taking into account their individual characteristics (Benito, Bonson

& Icarán, 2005). In this sense, we concur with Zabalza (2011) that the methodology is the curricular component that has the most effect on training.

The following section focuses on multimodality as the theoretical framework of the teaching practices described in section 4 and on introducing the portfolio as a tool for formative evaluation. The third section describes the main features of the participants and the context of this study. The fourth section focuses on analyzing multimodality when describing different activities that are part of a portfolio in the teaching practices conducted in English Language V in the English Studies degree. The fifth section offers methodology used in the study and the main research questions. The final sections show the results of a survey and the conclusions of the study.

Theoretical Framework

The theory of multimodality, developed through the work of Kress and van Leeuwen (2001, 2006) and other authors (e.g., Baldry & Thibault, 2006; Bezemer & Jewett, 2010; Bowcher, 2012, Hestbaek Andersen Maegerϕ & Tonnessen, 2015; Jewitt, 2009; Royce & Bowcher, 2007) has concentrated on texts that use more than one mode of communication to create meaning. In addition, Jewitt (2009, p. 2) specifies that multimodality refers to a field of application rather than a theory.

Following Machin (2007, p. x), we consider that what is special about the multimodal approach to communication is "the idea that all modes need to be considered with the same kind of detail, as semiotic systems in themselves, whose potential choices, patterns and grammar can be described and documented". In this sense, research in this field has helped to understand how various modes of communication (language, image, graphics, sound, music, gestures, etc.) create meanings, in Kress's words (2010):

> Each mode does a specific thing: image shows what takes too long to read, and writing names what would be difficult to show. Colour is used to highlight specific aspects of the overall message. Without that division of semiotic labour, the sign, quite simply, would not work. Writing names and images shows, while colour frames and highlights; each to maximum effect and benefit. (p. 1)

These modes are different semiotic resources that allow the creation of meaning by one separately or by the combination of several simultaneously. The image plays a key role in multimodal communication due to its ability to capture the attention (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006; Kress, 2010; Unsworth, 2010). O'Halloran (2011, p. 120) specifies the following on multimodal discourse analysis (MDA): "MDA itself is referred to as 'multimodality', 'multimodal analysis', 'multimodal semiotics' and 'multimodal studies'."

Studying the classroom as a context of multimodal learning allows us to realize the potential of learning that modes of communication other than language have compared to traditional texts consisting of writing only (Bearne, Clark, Johnson, Manford, Mottram &

Wolstencroft, 2007; Knox, 2008; Molina & Alonso, 2016; Mulatsih, 2016; Parodi, 2012; Walsh, 2009; Yelland, Lee, O'Rourke & Harrison, 2009), as Baldry and Thibault (2006, p. 21) state: "[...] multimodality refers to the diverse ways in which a number of distinct semiotic resource systems are both co-deployed and co-contextualised in the making of a text-specific meaning".

The preceding paragraphs have shown that multimodality deals with the different modes of communication, whereas the term multiliteracies refers more to the concrete practices of literacy, which implies that such practices are necessary for communication in society. Simpson and Walsh (2010 , p. 26) , make clear that this term is not new: "Evolving from the theorising on the New London Group (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000), the term 'multiliteracies' was concerned with the many types of communication apprehended in new and different social and cultural contexts, and for both print and electronic texts".

Multimodality enriches the whole teaching-learning process by allowing students to read and write in virtual environments, incorporate photographs and videos in the development of their skills, analyze, deconstruct and design multimodal texts, etc. This implies that evaluation should also include paying attention to different modes of communication. In this sense, it is necessary to use formative assessment so that the learning process is understood as a whole, following Pérez-Paredes and Rubio (2005, p. 606-607): "Evaluation considers the teaching and learning program as a whole, and seeks to obtain feedback that can serve different purposes for the different agents in education, from teachers to curriculum designers".

The fact that evaluation is understood as a formative continuous process that includes multimodality, demands the use of evaluation tools different from traditional exams. For this reason, using a portfolio as an instrument of formative evaluation does not only measure content but concentrate on how students learn, i.e., the different strategies that students use to carry out the proposed activities and to apply theoretical knowledge to practice. This means that students are active while they learn and immerse themselves into the process of becoming active citizens in society (Colen, Giné & Imbernon, 2006; Sánchez, 2006; Teichler, 2006).

A portfolio consists of a folder in which students keep several tasks to accomplish certain objectives and competencies selected by teachers. It is a useful tool for formative assessment because it offers materials that show students' progress, the grade to which contents have been assimilated, and the capacity to develop competences (Race, 2003). Specifically, the portfolio allows, first, the integration of the tasks of the learning process within the evaluation. Second, it helps to evaluate the students' achievements and their grade of maturity and autonomy. And third, it offers teachers more information about the effort students make and about each task accomplished. In this way, the portfolio illustrates the whole learning process and reflects how, when and where the different concepts, abilities and competences have been acquired by students (Martínez Lirola, 2012a, 2012b).

In designing portfolios, it is necessary to consider the main competences and objectives that students should have accomplished at the end of the evaluation process. Following Colen et al. (2006, p. 108), a portfolio evaluation is reliable if it seeks the following objectives:

- To help students assume responsibility for their own learning because they have to be involved in the evaluation process.
- To give teachers detailed information about students' work and progress.
- To integrate evaluation into the learning process.
- To encourage teachers and students to introduce changes in the way of teaching and learning.
- To organize and give coherence to the information that students have prepared.

It is essential that students see the purpose of each activity that is part of the portfolio. Consequently, Escobar (2001, p. 349) and Gibbs (2003, p. 68) propose steps to help students create and maintain their portfolio, so that its utility in the learning process can be observed by students at all stages of the teaching-learning process:

- Choose tasks according to the main learning objectives and competences.
- Define the evaluation criteria clearly.
- Design a pattern of self-evaluation so that students can perform different tasks and evaluate their results.
- Let students select the best tasks and write a report explaining why they have selected those tasks, before they come to an individual tutorial.
- Evaluate students' tasks according to the criteria that have been established and which are known by the students and by the lecturer.
- Talk about the portfolio in an individual tutorial.

Taking into consideration the previous pieces of advice implies that evaluation has to support the whole learning process and has to be a tool that facilitates judgement of what students have learned, i.e., there has to be a clear and direct relationship between the tools used for evaluation and the grades that students obtain. Consequently, it is not only students who should be evaluated but also the methodology used in the classroom, which has been chosen to help students acquire certain competences.

Participants and Context

English Language V is a core subject in the degree of English Studies at the University of Alicante. It is taught four hours a week as follows: the first class is to work on theoretical and practical aspects of academic writing. The second is dedicated to students' oral presentations following the indications given in the first classes of the subject. The third hour is for work on different grammatical aspects, and the fourth hour consists of a debate

on the topic of the oral presentation of the week. The group that presents each week is responsible for moderating and involving the whole class in the debate. In addition, students have to spend ten hours working autonomously on listening, proposed by the teacher, in the language laboratory.

This distribution of the classes shows that students have to work with different skills. The evaluation of the activities was done through a portfolio that consisted of the following tasks: a group oral presentation and the organization and participation in debates (30%), a written essay on the analysis of a text (40%) and listening activities in the language laboratory (10%). These three products of the portfolio are 80% of a student's grade. Students also had to sit a written exam on grammar (20%). Each of the activities that make up the portfolio contributes to make English Language V a multimodal subject (explained in detail in section 4). Moreover, promoting learning in different ways helps to increase the motivation of university students.

The main objective of English Language Course V is that students improve the five English language skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing and interaction) so that they acquire an advanced level of English. It is a compulsory subject taught in the third year of the degree in English Studies at the University of Alicante. All students have studied English in high school and in the two previous years of the degree. Most of the students want to become secondary school teachers, but some want to work as translators, interpreters or in companies engaged in foreign trade. There were 93 students registered in the said subject during the academic year 2015–16, 73 women and 20 men.

In the following section, the various activities that make up the multimodal portfolio will be explained. This section will be followed by the methodology and research questions. Following this, the results of a survey that identifies the key competencies that students acquire in a multimodal teaching-learning process and other aspects related to multimodality will be given.

Description of Multimodal Activities in the Subject English Language V

The following provides concrete examples of how the subject English Language V is multimodal.

The preparation of oral presentations requires students to use different bibliographical sources, including virtual ones, and selecting the relevant information from the secondary so that students develop their critical capacity. In addition, they have to develop other skills such as teamwork, the distribution of tasks and consensus in decision-making. Leadership is also promoted because students take the initiative to choose the topic for the oral presentation and the way it is organized, in addition to the multimodal resources that will be used for the presentation.

The students prepare multimodal oral presentations in which videos are used to illustrate some of the theoretical aspects offered in their presentations. Some groups use

background music that fits the topic proposed while doing the presentation. For example, in a presentation about the United States, the national anthem was chosen; in a presentation about China, traditional Chinese music was used. Mysterious music was chosen to do a presentation about the tarot.

- The debates students prepare on the same topic as the oral presentations also encourage multimodality, because they often begin by presenting a video on the chosen topic before the discussion begins. The video is often posted on the course's Facebook page so that ICTs are used. Moreover, before the discussion takes place in the classroom, students participate in the debate on the subject of the oral presentation presented through Facebook. The group responsible for conducting the oral presentation that week is also responsible for moderating the debate that takes place on Facebook. Students have to draw some conclusions to present in the debate that takes place in the classroom. In this way, oral and written skills are integrated again at the same time as group work and the use of ICT is promoted.

Students have to write an essay commenting on a text. In this activity, multimodality is present because the teacher explains the model of visual grammar of Kress and van Leeuwen (2006) and because several texts with various modes of communication are commented on. Once students have practiced analyzing different multimodal texts, they are asked to choose a multimodal text and write an academic essay. It should include the analysis of the visual, following the principles of visual grammar presented in class.   - Several listening activities consist of watching a video and answering questions related to it. Students have to watch at least two films in the collection in the language laboratory and write a film review, so that listening and writing skills are integrated.

Group oral presentations are the part of the subject that contributes most to the use of multimodality. The preparation of such oral presentations requires the supervision of the teacher in group tutorials so that students can talk about the structure and content of the presentation, the use of ICT and multimedia elements and about the coordination between the various members of the group (see section below). Multimodal oral presentations require technological and educational infrastructure, and a new attitude from the teachers and students towards employing different resources for learning and motivating in the classroom.

Methodology and Research Questions

The high number of students registered on the course meant that the teacher needed to design an evaluation proposal based on the use of the portfolio. In this sense, the teacher had to design the different activities that were part of the portfolio (see section 4), the dates when the activities were to be ready and the evaluation criteria. Once all this was clear and shared with students, the portfolio activities could start being prepared and handed in on the due dates during the semester. The portfolio had to include the different versions of the tasks so that students were aware of their improvements during the teaching-learning process and

thus appreciate the benefits of formative evaluation. The main research questions are the following: are students aware of the multimodal nature of the different tasks included in the portfolio? Are the different tasks of this portfolio effective for the acquisition of competences?

The portfolio had to be handed in on the last week of the semester (week 15), once all the students had completed all the activities. The following explains the methodology used in the classroom so that students worked on the different tasks that they had to submit for the portfolio. All the activities were designed not only to facilitate the acquisition of contents but also of competences. In addition, all the activities were multimodal. For this reason, when students handed in the portfolio, they were asked to complete an anonymous survey to gauge their opinion on some of the main aspects the teacher had considered when designing the portfolio.

At the beginning of the semester students were asked to organize themselves into groups of four or five in order to prepare cooperative oral presentations and debates. The teacher explained the main characteristics of effective oral presentations and shared some techniques to organize debates during the first three weeks of the semester. Special attention was given to the use of multimodal resources such as videos, images or music to motivate the audience. Having done this, students started to present their oral presentation and debates from week four. The week before the oral presentation was presented in the classroom, students had a group tutorial with the teacher in her office. The purpose of this tutorial was to supervise the preparation of the oral presentation and debate, to check the outline and power point that students had to include in the portfolio and to help students with the difficulties they were facing to develop them.

The outline had to include a news item based on the topic of oral presentation and a short summary of it, an outline with the main sections in which the presentation was divided, a list of ten words that students had learned, at least five questions to be used in the debate and a list of the main bibliographical references students had used to prepare this tasks. During the tutorial, the teacher made sure that all the sections were included in the outline, corrected the main spelling and grammatical mistakes and made sure that different multimodal resources were used. Moreover, the teacher supervised the different sections students had included in the power point that they were going to use in the classroom and the different sections and activities that they had prepared for the debate. The portfolio had to include the draft of the outline and the power point of the oral presentation that students discussed with the teacher in the group tutorial, as well as the new version that incorporated all the suggestions discussed in the group tutorial.

The second activity that is part of the portfolio concentrated on writing. For this reason, at the beginning of the semester the teacher explained the main cohesive devices in English (reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion). Authentic multimodal texts were used in order to illustrate said devices in context. The teacher

explained the main principles of visual grammar following Kress and van Leeuwen (2006), so that students were able to analyze multimodal texts as a whole and were able to read not only the written text but also the visual elements in it.

Once students had practiced analysing the main cohesive devices, the teacher explained the structure of the academic essay using different materials such as videos so that students were exposed to different multimodal texts. When students had understood the structure of the essay and the importance of cohesive devices so that the essay could be effective, they were asked to look for multimodal texts on a topic of their choice to write an academic essay based on it.

Asking students to analyze a written text and the image that accompanies it as a unit makes students aware of how meanings are constructed in the texts and of the importance of images in their global meaning. The essay had to be handed in during week 10 of the semester. After this, the teacher corrected each text and gave feedback to each student paying attention to cohesive devices, the visual analysis of the text and the structure of the essay. A new version of the essay had to be prepared incorporating all the changes requested by the teacher. Students had to include the multimodal text they had based their essay on and the two versions of the essay in the portfolio.

Finally, students had to prepare the listenings requested for the subject in the language laboratory. Students had to spend at least five hours doing the different listening activities on their own. In this sense, the listenings showed the importance of independent learning because students had to organise themselves in order to do the requested task before the deadline, which is importanz in formative assessment.

In the first class, the teacher explained to students how they had to register in the multimodal platform that the language laboratory provided. Once registered, students had access to the different multimodal activities that the teacher had prepared so that students could improve their listening skills at the same time that they acquired different competences such as independent learning.

Students had the whole semester to prepare the listenings requested at the beginning of the semester. In fact, they had to include the film reviews they had written after watching two movies and the documents with their answers after they had watched some videos. The students registered in the subject used the virtual campus to ask all their questions related to the listening tasks that they had to include in the portfolio.

Survey Analysis

When designing the tasks that were part of a portfolio, it was essential to consider the main competences students should acquire so that they could see the purpose of each task that is part of the portfolio. Competences should be connected with the requests of the labour market. Consequently, students were encouraged to see a relationship between what they learn in the classroom and the demands of society. For this reason, once we have referred to

the main multimodal activities that were part of the portfolio and to the methodology used in the classroom, it is important to refer to some of the main competences that students acquire by doing the required tasks:

- The development of critical thinking to encourage the reflexive capacity of students and to defend the work from possible criticism.
- To write correctly in English.
- To use ICTs.
- To use bibliographical sources, distinguishing relevant information for the ends of the activity from that which is complementary or anecdotal.
- To develop attitudes of responsibility in group work, division of tasks, balanced participation, consensus when taking decisions, etc.
- To defend arguments orally in English in front of many people.
- To be able to apply theoretical knowledge of English grammar to practical and real situations in the classroom.
- To be able to communicate in fluent spoken English.
- To work as autonomous and critical learners and do research on proposed topics.

Having referred to the main competences that students can acquire preparing the designed portfolio, it is important to know if they had been acquired. In fact, evaluation with a portfolio should be understood as a means to improve the teaching-learning process in such a way that students and teachers benefit (Christie & Simpson, 2010). For this reason, a survey was prepared in order to ascertain the extent to which students perceived the subject as multimodal and were aware of the competences and skills that they were acquiring (see Appendix 1). The results are presented below. Following Herrera and Enrique (2008), we consider the questionnaire an appropriate method, because it offers information on what students think about a certain subject and points out how they perceive their learning process.

With regard to the first question that asked students whether they were aware of receiving multimodal teaching during the teaching-learning process, 100% answered affirmatively.

The second question focuses on which of the various proposed modes of communication (explanations of the teacher in theoretical and practical classes using multimodality, organization of group oral presentations, writing texts through Facebook, doing oral or written exercises at home and in the classroom, participation in debates) they consider more useful in their learning process. It is noteworthy that 74.57% of the students surveyed indicate all of them. People who did not choose to mark all the proposed modes of communication gave great importance to the explanations of the teacher, to doing exercises in the classrooms or at home and to the debates.

The third question asks whether the students consider that their motivation to learn is

affected by the subject being multimodal and also by formative assessment, which pays attention to the different skills. Almost all students surveyed, 98.30%, with the exception of one person (1.7%) answered yes, emphasizing that multimodality directly influences their motivation.[1]

The fourth question focuses on the competences that students consider they have developed with this subject: critical thinking, writing correctly in English, using ICT, teamwork and independent learning. Most of the surveyed students choose several competences, but the most outstanding is teamwork (72.88%); 57.32% of the students surveyed selected learning autonomously, followed by writing English correctly, chosen by 53.82%.

The fifth question asks students in what other ways English Language V could be multimodal to facilitate the learning process. The vast majority, 85% consider the subject very well designed and made no proposal. The remaining 15% proposed organizing debates in which whose first language is English participate. Some students also mentioned that preparation of a video in groups could also be part of the assessment, or the preparation of a blog. In this way, students could integrate different skills and use ICT while they learn English. This is already done with the participation in the debate in Facebook or the preparation of oral presentations.

The sixth question asks about the role of tutorials in the multimodal teaching-learning process. In fact, 55% of the students surveyed consider them important to monitor the development of their learning; 35% answered that they are necessary to some extent and only 10% said they could do without them.[2]

Since this is not a specific article on mentoring and tutorials, we will not discuss in depth the place they occupy in higher education. However, we would like to end this section by showing that, in our opinion as teachers, mentoring is important for the multimodal autonomous teaching-learning process to be effective. The teacher has to offer guidance throughout the teaching-learning process and give advice to students to develop the various activities that make up the portfolio described above. Thus, like Cano Gonzalez (2009) and Garcia et al. (2005), we understand mentoring and tutorials as one of our responsibilities as teachers because, thanks to them, a more personalized relationship between teachers and students is established.

Conclusions

The fact that assessment in English Language V takes place through a portfolio that promotes multimodality ensures that students take responsibility for their learning process because they have an active role in the evaluation process. In addition, this evaluation tool helps students become the centre of the teaching-learning process and be aware of the importance of the acquisition of competences while they learn. In fact, students and teachers interact and share the responsibility and are able to modify the activities or the evaluation

criteria so that evaluation in particular or the teaching-learning process in general can be improved.

The use of different multimodal strategies (videos, Facebook, text with images, etc.) benefits the students' creativity because they make an effort to employ different techniques or resources to improve interaction. In fact, students have to reflect on their own work and to improve the ability to search for, select, analyse and evaluate information, in such a way that they are active in the construction and acquisition of knowledge.

Multimodal classes facilitate learning and make students be creative and active while they learn. This means that students not only learn content but also competences that will be useful in the labor market and in life. Encouraging students to be leaders and to be active in the teaching-learning process helps them to take decisions about the text they choose, to select the topic of their oral presentation, to think how it can incorporate multimodal resources, to decide what they write on the Facebook page of the subject, to be aware of how they contribute to group interaction, etc.

Using different and varied multimodal resources in English Language V for both learning and assessment establishes a direct relationship between the subject and real life, since multimodality is present at all levels in life: in advertising, television, social networks, and others. Understanding the classroom as a multimodal environment means the different modes of communication used contribute to motivating students. In fact, the teaching-learning process is dynamic and creative, which facilitates students' learning processes.

Notes

1. For specific studies on the motivation of university students, see: Crespo and Martínez Lirola, 2008; Martínez Lirola and Crespo, 2008; Martínez Lirola, Martin Hueto and Terrés Fernández, 2010.
2. For specific studies on the use of tutorials at the university, see: Martínez Lirola (2007 and 2008); Martínez Lirola and Crespo (2009a and 2009b).

References

Apple, M., & Shimo, E. (2004). Learners to teacher: Portfolios, please! Perceptions of portfolio assessment in EFL classrooms. In T. Newfields, Y. Ishida, M. Chapman & M. Fujioka (Eds.), *The interface between language, pragmatics and assessment* (pp. 53–58). Tokyo: Tokyo Keizai University.

Baldry, A., & Thibault, P. (2006). *Multimodal transcription and text analysis.* London: Equinox.

Bearne, E., Clark, C., Johnson, A., Manford P., Mottram, M., & Wolstencroft, H. (2007). *Reading on screen research report.* London: United Kingdom Literacy Association.

Benito, A., & Cruz, A. (2005). Introducción. In A. Benito & A. Cruz (Coords.), *Nuevas*

claves para la docencia universitaria en el Espacio Europeo de Educación Superior (pp. 11–21). Madrid: Narcea.

Bezemer, J., & Jewett, C. (2010). Multimodal analysis: Key issues. In L. Litosseliti, (Ed.), *Research methods in linguistics* (pp. 181–197). London: Continuum.

Bowcher, W. L. (Ed.) (2012). *Multimodal texts from around the world: Cultural and linguistic insights.* London: Palgrave.

Bueno González, A., & Nieto García, J. M. (2009). English language teaching in the European Higher Education Area (EHEA): Towards uniformity or diversity?. In M. L. Pérez Cañado (Ed.), *English language teaching in the European credit transfer system. Facing the challenge* (pp. 55–72). Bern: Peter Lang.

Cano González, R. (2009). Tutoría universitaria y aprendizaje por competencias. ¿Cómo lograrlo? *REIFOP, 12*(1), 181–204. Retrieved July 25, 2016, from http://www.aufop.com/

Christie, F., & Simpson, A. (2010). *Literacy and social responsibility*. London: Equinox.

Coffin, C. (2012). Editorial. English for academic purposes: Contributions from systemic functional linguistics and academic literacies. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 11*, 1–3.

Colen, M., Giné, N., & Imbernon, F. (2006). *La carpeta de aprendizaje del alumnado universitario*. Barcelona: Octaedro.

Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (Eds.) (2000). *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures.* South Yarra: Macmillan.

Crespo, E., & Martínez Lirola, M. (2008). Convergencia europea, motivación y actuación docente en el aula universitaria. *Revista de Enseñanza Universitaria, 31*, 4-16. Retrieved July 30, 2016, from http://institucional.us.es/revistas/revistas/universitaria/htm/indice.htm

Escobar, C. (2001). La evaluación. In L. Nussbaum & M. Bernaus (Eds.), *Didáctica de las lenguas extranjeras en la Educación Secundaria Obligatoria* (pp. 325-358). Madrid: Síntesis.

Gibbs, G. (2003). Uso estratégico de la evaluación en el aprendizaje. In S. Brown & A. Glasner (Eds.), *Evaluar en la universidad. Problemas y nuevos enfoques* (pp. 61–74). Translated by Miguel Callizo. Madrid: Narcea.

Guerrero Cuentas, H. R. (2015). El portafolio: Una herramienta facilitadora del cambio en la educación superior desde la práctica didáctica**.** *Zona Próxima, 22*, 143-155.

Hall, D. R. (2001). Materials production: Theory and practice. In D. Hall & A. Hewings (Eds.), *Innovation in English language teaching: A reader* (pp. 229-239). London: Routledge.

Hestbaek Andersen, T., Maegerɸ, E., & Tonnessen, E.S. (2015). *Social semiotics: Key figures, new directions*. London: Routledge.

Hernández, F. (2003). Enseñar y aprender en la Universidad: una adaptación necesaria de las

titulaciones al Espacio Europeo de Educación Superior. *Circunstancia, Revista de Ciencias Sociales, 8*, 173–190.

Herrera, L. & Enrique, C. (2008). Proyectos de innovación en tutorías en la Universidad de Granada: Análisis de los instrumentos empleados. *Profesorado. Revista de Currículum y Formación del Profesorado, 12*(2). Retrieved July 30, 2016, from http://www.ugr.es/local/recfpro/rev122COL5.pdf

Jewitt, C. (2006). *Technology, literacy and learning. A multimodal approach.* London: Routledge.

Jewitt, C. (Ed.). (2009). *The Routledge handbook of multimodal analysis.* London: Routledge.

Knox, J. S. (2008). Online newspaper and TESOL classrooms: A multimodal perspective. In L. Unsworth (Ed.), *Multimodal semiotics. Functional analysis in contexts of education* (pp. 139–158). London: Continuum.

Kress, G. (2009). What is mode? In C. Jewitt (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of multimodal analysis* (pp. 54-67). London: Routledge.

Kress, G. (2010). *Multimodality. A social semiotic approach to contemporary communication.* London: Routledge.

Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2001). *Multimodal discourse.* London: Routledge.

Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2006). *Reading images: The grammar of visual design.* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Lemke, J. L. (2012). Multimedia and discourse analysis. In J. P. Gee & M. Handford (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 79–89). London: Routledge.

Livingstone, S. (2008). *Digital literacies: Tracing the implications for learners and learning.* Bristol: Economic and Social Research Council.

López Noguero, F. (2005). *Metodología participativa en la enseñanza universitaria*. Madrid: Narcea.

Machin, D. (2007). *Introduction to multimodal analysis*. London: Hodder Arnold.

McWethy, D., & Gradwell, J. (1998). Portfolios: Viable in vocational education. *Canadian Vocational Journal, 33*(3), 11–13.

Martínez Lirola, M. (2007). El nuevo papel del profesor universitario en el proceso de convergencia europea y su relación con la interacción, la tutoría y el aprendizaje autónomo. *Porta Linguarum, 7*, 31–43.

Martínez Lirola, M. (2008). Explorando las tutorías en el proceso de convergencia europea. *Revista de Enseñanza Universitaria, 32*, 29–36.

Martínez Lirola, M. (2012a). Evaluation proposal based on the ECTS system: Evaluating the four skills in a university core subject with a portfolio. *Porta Linguarum, 17*, 189–201.

Martínez Lirola, M. (2012b). Evaluating with a portfolio in the European Higher Education Framework: An example from English studies. *Revista Española de Lingüística*

Aplicada (RESLA), 25, 147–164.

Martínez Lirola, M. & Crespo, E. (2008). Explorando las variables incidentes en la motivación del alumno de Filología Inglesa en el ámbito del Espacio Europeo de Educación Superior. In G. Merma Molina & F. Pastor Verdú (Coords.), *Aportaciones curriculares para la interacción en el aprendizaje. Redes de investigación docente-espacio europeo de educación superior* (pp. 119–135). Vol. I. Alcoy: Marfil.

Martínez Lirola, M., & Crespo, E. (2009a). La tutoría universitaria en el modelo de la convergencia europea. In C. Gómez Lucas & S. Grau Company (Eds.), *Propuestas de diseño e innovaciones curriculares y metodología en el EEES* (pp. 451–466). Alcoy: Marfil.

Martínez Lirola, M., & Crespo, E. (2009b). La importancia de las tutorías en el marco del EEES. *VII Jornadas de Redes de Investigación en Docencia Universitaria. La calidad del proceso de enseñanza-aprendizaje universitario desde la perspectiva del cambio* (pp. 499–504). Alicante. Alcoy: Marfil.

Martínez Lirola, M., Martín Hueto, M.I., & Terrés Fernández, T. (2010). Relación entre la evaluación y la motivación del alumnado con el uso del portafolio. *VIII Jornadas de Redes de Investigación en Docencia Universitaria. Nuevas titulaciones y cambio universitario* (pp. 472–480). Alcoy: Marfil.

Martínez Lirola, M., & Rubio, F. (2009). Students' beliefs about portfolio evaluation and its influence on their learning outcomes to develop EFL in a Spanish context. *International Journal of English Studies (IJES), 9*(1), 91–111.

Merchant, G. (2009). Literacy in virtual worlds. *Journal of Research in Reading, 32*(1), 38–56.

Molina, S. & Alonso, I. (2016). The construction of meaning in multimodal discourse. A digital story as a case study. In M. Romano & M. D. Porto (Eds.), *Exploring discourse strategies in social and cognitive interaction* (pp. 111–135). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Mulatsih, S. (2016). Multimodal materials in teaching genre-based writing: A way to promote students' multimodal literacies. *The Asian EFL Journal, 94*, 4–22.

O'Halloran, K. L. (2011). Multimodal discourse analysis. In K. Hyland & B. Paltridge (Eds.), *The Continuum companion to discourse analysis* (pp. 120–137). London/New York: Continuum.

O'Keeffe, A., McCarthy, M., & Carter, R. (2007). *From corpus to classroom: Language use and language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge Language Teaching Library.

O'Malley, J. M., & Valdez Pierce, L. (1996). *Authentic assessment for English language learners*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Parodi, G. (2012). University genres and multisemiotic features: Accessing specialized knowledge through disciplinarity**.** *Forum Linguist, 9*(4), 259–282.

Pérez Paredes, P., & Rubio, F. (2005). Testing and assessment. In D. Madrid, N. Mclaren &

A. Bueno (Eds.), *TEFL in secondary education* (pp. 605–639). Granada: Universidad de Granada.

Pereyra-García, M. A., Sevilla, M., & Luzón, A. (2006). Las universidades españolas y el proceso de la construcción del Espacio Europeo de Ecuación Superior. Limitaciones y perspectivas de cambio. *Revista Española de Educación Comparada, 12*, 37–80.

Race, P. (2003). ¿Por qué evaluar de un modo innovador? In S. Brown & A. Glasner (Eds.), *Evaluar en la universidad: Problemas y nuevos enfoques* (pp. 77–90). Translated by Miguel Callizo. Madrid: Narcea.

Royce, T. D., & Bowcher, W. L. (Eds.). (2007). *New directions in the analysis of multimodal discourse.* London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Sánchez, A. (2006). Innovación en la construcción del espacio europeo de educación superior: Camino de London 2007. *Foro de Educación, 7-8*, 119–129.

Simpson, A., & Walsh, M. (2010). Multiple literacies: Implications for changed pedagogy. In F. Christie & A. Simpson (Eds.), *Literacy and social responsibility* (pp. 24–39). London: Equinox.

Teichler, U. (2006). El espacio europeo de educación superior: Visiones y realidades de un proceso deseable de convergencia. *Revista Española de Educación Comparada, 12*, 113–144.

Unsworth, L. (2001). *Teaching multiliteracies across the curriculum: Changing contexts of text and image in classroom practice.* Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.

Unsworth, L. (Ed.). (2008a). *New literacies and the English curriculum*. London: Continuum.

Unsworth, L. (Ed.). (2008b). *Multimodal semiotics. Functional analysis in contexts of education*. London: Continuum.

Unsworth, L. (2010). Resourcing multimodal literacy pedagogy. Toward a description of the meaning-making resources of language-image interaction. In T. Locke (Ed.), *Beyond the grammar wars* (pp. 276–293). London: Routledge.

Van Leeuwen, T. (2014). Critical discourse analysis and multimodality. In C. Hart & P. Cap (Eds.), *Contemporary critical discourse studies* (pp. 281–295). London/ New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Walsh, M. (2009). Pedagogic potentials of multiple literacies. In L. Tan Wee Hin & R. Subramanian (Eds.), *Handbook of research on new media literacy at the K–12 level: Issues and challenges* (pp. 32–47). Hershey, PA: IGI Global.

Wright, W. A., Knight, P., & Pomerlau, N. (1999). Portfolio people: Teaching and learning dossiers and innovation in higher education. *Innovate Higher Education, 24*(2), 89–103.

Yelland, N., Lee, L., O'Rourke, M., & Harrison, C. (2009). Rethinking pathways to print literacy: A multiliteracies perspective. *Practically Primary, 14*(1), 4–6.

Zabalza, M. A. (2011). Metodología docente. *Revista de Docencia Universitaria REDU.*

Monográfico El espacio europeo de educación superior. ¿Hacia dónde va la Universidad Europea?, *9*(3), 75–98. Retrieved July 30, 2016, from http://redaberta.usc.es/redu

Appendix 1: SURVEY ON MULTIMODAL TEACHING

English Language V is planned as a multimodal subject, i.e., communication is done through written, oral language, music, videos, Facebook, etc.

1. Have you been aware of this during the teaching-learning process?

Yes

If not, why not?

2. Which of the various modes of communication proposed help you most in your learning process? (You can give a percentage to each answer)

- Explanations of the teacher in theoretical and practical classes.

- Preparation of group oral presentations.

- Writing texts through Facebook.

- Doing oral or written exercises at home and in class.

- Participating in class debates.

- Other (specify)

3. Does it affect your motivation to learn that the course is multimodal and is evaluated through formative assessment, paying attention to the different skills?

Yes

If not, why not?

4. Which of the following competences do you think you have developed more with

this subject? (You can give a percentage for each)

- Critical thinking
- Writing correctly in English
- Use of ICTs
- Teamwork
- Autonomous Learning
- Other (specify)

5. In what other ways could English Language V be multimodal to facilitate your learning?

6. What is the role of tutorials in the multimodal teaching-learning process?

- They are essential.
- They are necessary to some extent.
- I could do without them.