

- Peer-Reviewed, Open Access Journal
- Indexed in NepJOL; Star-Ranked in JPPS
- Permanently Archived in Portico



Research Article/ DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3126/sjah.v8i2.98650>

Rethinking Writing in Nepal's Secondary English Curriculum: A Multimodal Perspective

Sanjeev Niraula



PhD candidate, University of Texas at El Paso, USA

Article History: Received: 15 May 2026; Reviewed: 25 May–25 July 2026; Accepted: 28 July 2026

Email: sniraula@miners.utep.edu

Copyright 2026 © The Author(s). The publisher may reuse published articles with prior permission of the concerned author(s). The work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0). www.cdetu.edu.np



Abstract

This study examines how writing is conceptualized in Nepal's Grade 11 and Grade 12 English curriculum through a multimodal perspective. Although global scholarship in multimodality and multiliteracies emphasizes on meaning-making that occurs through linguistic, visual, spatial, digital, and audio modes, writing instructions in Nepal's curriculum remain largely print-centric. Addressing this issue, the study employs a qualitative document analysis of 40 units from the Grade 11 and 12 English textbooks. Using the theoretical lens of multimodality developed by New London Group, Cynthia Selfe, Jody Shipka, and iterative coding procedures informed by Johnny Saldaña's framework, the analysis focuses on genre types, modes of composition, and instructional emphases embedded in the writing tasks. Findings reveal three central themes: writing is framed primarily as a print-based, alphabetic activity; writing is treated as a grammar-and structure-oriented practice; and multimodality appears as content to be interpreted rather than as a legitimate mode of composition. These patterns indicate a monomodal conception of writing that diverges from contemporary understandings of multimodal literacy. Finally, this study proposes an early interventionist approach at the pedagogical and evaluative levels to expand the definition of writing in secondary English education to include multimodal forms of expression.

Keywords: English curriculum analysis, Multimodal composition, secondary education, writing curriculum

Introduction

In contemporary communication, meaning is increasingly made through the integration of multiple modes, including linguistic, visual, audio, gestural, and design (Kress 80; New London Group 65; Takayoshi and Selfe 1). From social media posts and videos to presentations and online publications, writing in everyday life is rarely confined to alphabetic text alone. Yet in many educational contexts, writing continues to be defined in predominantly print-based and linguistic

terms. This tension between expanding communicative practices and traditional definitions of writing raises important questions about what forms of meaning-making are recognized and valued in formal education. Jody Shipka, a prominent scholar on multimodality, writes, "The disjunction between the multimodal world of communication which is available in the wider community and the conventional print modes of the standard curriculum [makes] students feel alienated from what schools have to offer" (7). She argues that this gap, between curricular and extracurricular literacy practices, demands a reimagined, more inclusive vision of composition, in which print and digital mediums intersect, overlap, and become intertextual.

This gap is evident in Nepal's secondary English curriculum. The curriculum of Grade 11 and 12 was revised in 2020 and 2021 respectively with a focus on two major sections: language development and literature. The language development section intends to develop intensive reading skills and foster competence in grammar, vocabulary, speech and writing of different types. The literature section includes genre-based literary texts for both intensive and extensive reading so as to enable the learners to discern different aspects of the literary texts and practice creative writing (Curriculum Development Centre, *English, Grade 11*; *English, Grade 12*). Despite the revision in the curriculum, the underlying conception of writing remains largely centered on alphabetic, print-based forms. As a result, opportunities for students to engage in multimodal composition remain limited within formal writing instruction.

This study examines the writing components of the current Grade 11 and Grade 12 English curricula in Nepal to explore how writing is defined and which forms of meaning-making are included or excluded within that definition. Drawing on a multimodal theoretical framework as established by New London Group, Cynthia Selfe, and Jody Shipka, the study argues that the curriculum foregrounds a narrow, print-centric model of writing that does not reflect contemporary multimodal literacy practices. By highlighting the absence of multimodal composition in the writing sections, this study makes a case for expanding the definition of writing in secondary English education to include multimodal forms of expression. Against this backdrop, this study is guided by these research questions: How is writing conceptualized in the Grade 11 and 12 English curriculum in Nepal and in what way does the curriculum's definition of writing align with contemporary understandings of multimodal literacy?

Answering how writing is conceptualized and whether it aligns with contemporary literacy requires clarifying the key terms that frame this study. The next section therefore provides a concise overview of multimodality, multimodal composition, and digital multimodal composition, establishing the theoretical lenses guiding the analysis.

Multimodality, Multimodal Composition, and Digital Multimodal Composition

An early and major contribution on theorizing multimodality was made by the New London Group. In their seminal 1996 article, the ten scholars from Australia, Great Britain and the United States, known as the members of New London Group (NLG) introduced the concept of "multiliteracies" to account for "the multiplicity of communication channels and media, and the increasing salience of cultural and linguistic diversity" (New London Group 63). While the traditional literacy remains centered on language only, multiliteracies focus "on modes of representation much broader than language alone" (64). The NLG further argued that meaning making is made not only through language but through different modes: visual, audio, spatial and gestural (65). Motivated by the work of multiliteracies of NLG, scholars began advocating multimodality by expanding the concept of text beyond written print/linguistic dominant forms to those comprised of multiple modes for meaning making.

Multimodality, simply put, refers to the use of two or more modes for the purpose of communicating an intended message or meaning. A mode refers to a unit of expression and representation. Gunther Kress, a prominent scholar of multimodality, defines mode as a set of socially and culturally shaped resources for making meaning: a 'channel' of representation or communication (79). Notably, numerous modes are available for communicative purposes, and common modes include those that are linguistic in nature (e.g. written text, speech), visual (e.g. images, colors), aural

(e.g. music, spoken language, soundtracks), gestural (e.g. actions, hand gestures, facial gestures) and spatial (e.g. the layout or arrangement of items) (Kress 80; New London Group 65). Communication becomes multimodal when two or more of these modes are purposefully combined to convey meaning.

While multimodality refers to the different modes for meaning making process, multimodal composition refers to the composing that goes beyond alphabetic texts. In multimodal composition, an individual integrates linguistic mode with one or more non-linguistic modes. Pamela Takayoshi and Cynthia L. Selfe, two important scholars in writing studies and early advocates of multimodal composing, define multimodal composition as “texts that exceed the alphabetical and may include still and moving images, animators, color, words, music, and sound” (1). Although scholars have defined multimodality in various ways, their perspectives converge on the idea that multimodal composition refers to the texts with purposeful selection and combination of multiple modes to communicate an idea to a particular audience.

With the rise of digital technologies, digital multimodal composition (DMC) has become increasingly common in academic, personal, and professional contexts. The term DMC itself refers to the production of digital texts, which apart from a linguistic mode (i.e. written text), integrate additional modes of communication (e.g. aural, visual, gestural, and spatial resources) for the purpose of conveying meaning (Kessler and Marino 370). DMC situates multimodal components in digital space. That means, DMC depends upon digital technologies for its production and circulation. A video, for example, is a digital multimodal composition because its creation (shooting, editing) and distribution (e.g., YouTube) depend on digital technologies. DMC is not only multimodal but also inherently digital in its production, publication, and circulation.

Defining these terms sets the foundation for addressing a more central question: why multimodality? Before analyzing the curriculum, it is important to articulate why multimodal perspectives are critical for understanding contemporary writing practices and what is lost when curricula remain limited to alphabetic forms.

Why Multimodality? The Global Turn

The scholars advocating the “multimodal turn” in writing have been telling a very persuasive and influential narrative about the past, present, and future of composition studies—a narrative about how and why a shift from alphabetic literacy to multimodal literacy is essential. Cynthia L. Selfe asserts the exigence of multimodal composition in writing: “If our profession continues to focus solely on the teaching of alphabetic composition—either online or in print—we run the risk of making composition studies increasingly irrelevant to students engaging in contemporary practices of communicating” (72). Her point is clear: although digital technologies have transformed how people communicate, writing instruction has not kept pace. If composition classrooms remain centered on print-based writing, they fail to prepare students for the communicative practices that shape their everyday lives. For Selfe, expanding composition to include multimodality is necessary for maintaining the relevance of the field.

Like Selfe, Jody Shipka also calls for a rethinking of composition to bridge the gap between the diverse communicative practices students regularly engage in outside school and the restricted forms typically valued in academic writing classrooms. She notes, “the disjunction between the multimodal world of communication which is available in the wider community and the conventional print modes of the standard curriculum” can alienate students from school literacy (7). She argues that this gap demands a more inclusive vision of composition, one in which print and digital mediums intersect, overlap, and become intertextual.

Shipka's argument builds on, but also departs from, earlier scholars who framed multimodality in terms of digital and technological shifts. Andrea Lunsford emphasizes the multiple modes available for composition in today's world emphasizing how writing has become multimodal practice. She observes, “Where writing once meant print text—black marks on white paper, left to right and top to bottom— today ‘writing’ is in full Technicolor; it is nonlinear and alive with sounds, voices, and images of all kinds” (xiii). Lovett et al. similarly highlight how digital technologies have

moved communication “well beyond the technology of ink and paper” (288). Palmeri goes further, framing multimodal composing not simply as an emerging practice but as the defining mode of literacy, declaring that “alphabetic literacy is our past; multimodal composing is our future” (5).

The synthesized views of these scholars underscore a decisive shift in composition studies: multimodality is no longer an optional supplement to alphabetic writing but a central component of how writing is conceived, practiced, and taught. Their arguments, while emerging from Western composition studies, highlight a global shift toward multimodal understandings of writing, one that has yet to be reflected in Nepal's secondary English curriculum.

Multimodality in Secondary Education in Nepal: An Unaddressed Gap

Despite the global momentum toward multimodal composition, the secondary educational landscape in Nepal remains largely anchored in monomodal, print-centric traditions. Existing scholarship in Nepal mainly focuses on the issues of grammar instruction, ICT integration, and thematic content but rarely connects them through a multimodal perspective. Historically, Nepali English language teaching (ELT) research has prioritized grammar as the fundamental component of learning language. Studies by researchers such as Bal Ram Adhikari and Ram Nath Neupane have extensively mapped teachers' perceptions, strategies, practices, and challenges related to grammar instruction. Such scholarship reflects an emphasis on linguistic accuracy and form-focused instruction, reinforcing a conception of writing as a predominantly print-based and rule-governed activity.

Apart from grammar, few studies such as those by Shakya et al. and Thapa and Sein have also examined the role of information, communication and technology (ICT) in teaching and learning in Nepal's secondary education. For instance, Paudyal and Rana argue online classes enabled lecturers and students to manage online learning and improve technological skills with the consistent practice of various information and communication technology (ICT) tools (1006). Similarly, Baral, Bhatta and Ghimire in their study of emergency remote teaching (ERT) in Nepal during COVID-19, highlight both the challenges and advantages of ERT experienced by the both the teachers and students, urging “the academic planners, policymakers, curriculum designers, educational administrators, and teachers in identifying and implementing different tools, strategies, and methods for making ERT more interactive and motivational” (18). However, while these studies acknowledge the increasing presence of digital technologies in educational contexts, their focus remains primarily on technological access, instructional delivery, perception and experience of teachers and students rather than on multimodal meaning-making practices. In other words, ICT integration is often discussed as a pedagogical support system rather than as a framework for rethinking composition.

A few scholars have turned their attention to the Grade 11 and Grade 12 English textbooks. Jib Nath Timsina evaluates the curricular weight of English textbooks of Grade 11 and Grade 12 and concludes that the four credit hours of English of Grade 11 and 12 is lower than other subjects (88). Similarly, studies have also focused on the thematic readings of the content of the English Curriculum. Pandey and Bhusal find that the textbooks remain neutral on caste discrimination, a finding that echoes the work of Pandey and Niraula on how casteism is reproduced through language, thereby prompting calls for enacting anti-discriminatory pedagogies in the classrooms (Pandey and Bhusal 23).

Despite these contributions, research on multiliteracies and multimodal pedagogy in Nepal remains scarce. While some scholars have examined multilingualism, translanguaging, and diverse classroom practices, very few have addressed multiliteracies pedagogy directly. Nani Babu Ghimire discusses the ways to implement multiliteracy in classroom teaching. His work shows that teachers overwhelmingly rely on print-based literacy practices because they lack technological training and schools lack adequate resources (104). Likewise, Shiva Lal Acharya's comparative study on multiliteracy between Finland and Nepal further reveals that Nepal's basic education system privileges linguistic approaches, treats audio-visual modes as secondary, and positions digital modes as merely complementary (60).

While existing scholarship in Nepal has examined English language teaching, digital literacy, ICT integration, and curriculum reform, little attention has been paid to how writing itself is conceptualized within the curriculum from a multimodal perspective. In particular, there remains limited scholarship examining whether Nepal's secondary English curriculum recognizes multimodal composition as a legitimate form of writing. Addressing this gap, this study analyzes how writing is defined in the Grade 11 and 12 English curriculum and evaluates its alignment with contemporary multimodal literacy frameworks.

Methodology

This study employs a qualitative document analysis approach to examine how writing is conceptualized in the Grade 11 and Grade 12 English curricula in Nepal. Curriculum documents, including unit-wise course outlines and descriptions of writing tasks, serve as the primary data for analysis. The corpus consists of 40 units (20 from Grade 11 and 20 from Grade 12), each containing one primary writing task. Document analysis is appropriate for this study because curricula function as policy texts that shape classroom practices and communicate institutional definitions of literacy and learning.

The analysis focuses specifically on the writing components across units in both grade levels. Each listed writing task was examined to identify the types of genres assigned, the modes of meaning-making permitted, and the instructional emphases associated with the tasks. To conduct this analysis systematically, the study uses qualitative coding methods informed by Johnny Saldaña's framework for coding qualitative data. Coding is understood as a process of organizing and interpreting data by assigning labels that capture key attributes, patterns, and meanings.

In the first cycle of coding, writing tasks were categorized according to genre type (e.g., essay, report, narrative), mode of composition (alphabetic, visual, digital, etc.), and primary instructional focus (grammar, structure, content, or rhetorical design). These codes allowed for the identification of patterns in how writing is framed across the curriculum. In the second cycle of coding, broader thematic categories were developed to interpret the underlying conception of writing promoted by the curriculum, such as "writing as an alphabetic, print-based activity", "writing as grammar and structure-oriented practice" and "multimodality as topic rather than mode of writing"

By combining document analysis with iterative coding procedures, this methodology enables a close examination of both the explicit features of writing tasks and the implicit curricular assumptions about what counts as writing. The goal is not only to describe the types of writing included in the curriculum but also to critically interpret how these inclusions and exclusions reflect a predominantly print-centric model of literacy.

Discussion and Analysis

In the analysis of the conceptualization of writing in Grade 11 and Grade 12 English textbooks, my focus is mainly on the language section because this section is explicitly intended to "foster writing of different types" (CDC, *English, Grade 11*; *English, Grade 12*). Within the language section, the unit of analysis is the writing tasks prescribed in the "Writing Column" across both textbooks. These writing tasks constitute my core data for examining the curriculum's definition of writing and the forms of meaning-making it recognizes and prioritizes. The tables below present the full list of writing tasks in the Grade 11 and Grade 12 textbooks, which serve as the empirical basis for the thematic analysis that follows.

Table 1. Writing Tasks in Grade 11 English Textbook

Units	Writing Tasks	Units	Writing Tasks
1.	Personal narrative	11.	Essay
2.	Paragraph writing	12.	Narrating events
3.	Paragraph writing	13.	Email, communicate
4.	Email, table interpretation	14.	Paragraph essay
5.	Paragraph	15.	Essay
6.	Essay instruction	16.	Critical writing
7.	Personal letters, essay	17.	News story
8.	Argumentative essay	18.	Book/film review
9.	Short biography, speech	19.	Travelogue essay
10.	Writing a diary	20.	Interpreting para-orthographic texts.

Table 2. Writing Tasks in Grade 12 English Textbook

Units	Writing Tasks	Units	Writing Tasks
1.	Email	11.	Essay
2.	Essay	12.	Essay, newspaper article
3.	News story, argumentative essay	13.	Describing event, essay
4.	Press release	14.	Essay
5.	Autobiography	15.	Business letter
6.	News Article	16.	Summary
7.	Describing event and people	17.	Paragraph, personal letter
8.	Paragraph, letter to the editor	18.	Biography
9.	Book/film review, drafting a speech	19.	Interpretation of chart
10.	Application letter	20.	Short account, article

Guided by the coding procedure outlined in the methodology section, first, I separated the writing tasks directly from the language sections of both English textbooks. Thereafter, I categorized the writing tasks based on genres such as personal narratives, paragraph writing, essays of various types (including argumentative, narrative, and critical writing), emails, short biographies, news stories and others. I further categorized the data based on modes of composition highlighting which mode is dominantly prescribed for writing. In the second cycle of coding, I synthesized these initial codes into three interpretive themes. These themes illustrate the curriculum's underlying conception of writing and limited engagement with multimodal forms of meaning-making.

Writing as an Alphabetic and Print-Based Activity

In the Grade 11 and Grade 12 English textbooks, writing is predominantly conceptualized as an alphabetic and print-based activity organized around conventional academic and school-based genres. The writing tasks prescribed across units 1-20 include personal narratives, paragraph writing, essays of various types (including argumentative, narrative, and critical writing), emails, short biographies, news stories, reviews, and travelogues (See Tables 1 and 2). Together, these tasks emphasize linear text production and adherence to established structural and generic conventions, positioning writing primarily as a linguistic practice.

In the textbook of Grade 11, paragraph writing and essay-based writing recur across multiple units indicating emphasis on prose forms. Whether it is the writing instruction on paragraph writing in on "My school library" (19), "Interesting dream" (48), "National hero who fought bravely in the Anglo-Nepal war" (134), or the essay-based writing on "Benefits of Yoga" (59), "Superstitions of your community" (75), "War and Peace" (142), the focus is on composition through alphabetic text. These repeated genre expectations suggest that writing competence is closely associated with mastery of paragraph and essay structures. In addition, narrative-oriented tasks such as personal narratives, personal letters, and narrating events further reinforce alphabetic text as the primary mode of writing.

This print-centric orientation is evident in the Grade 12 English textbook too. Writing tasks continue to prioritize alphabetic genres such as essays in Units 1, 3, 11, 12, 13, and 14, and paragraph writing in Units 7, 8, 13, and 17. For instance, students are required to write an essay on “The Importance of Family” (13) and to compose descriptive paragraphs based on character sketches or situational prompts (146). These patterns across the Grade 11 and Grade 12 English textbooks indicate how the curriculum privileges print-centric forms of writing and reinforces a monomodal conception of writing grounded in linguistic expression and conventional genre structures.

Writing as Grammar and Structure-Oriented Practice

In the Grade 11 and Grade 12 English textbook, writing is also framed as a practice oriented towards grammatical accuracy and structural conformity. Writing tasks are regularly paired with discrete grammar instruction suggesting that writing functions as a site for applying prescribed grammatical forms. While this alignment is not consistent across all units, a recurring pattern can be observed in which writing tasks are framed in ways that reflect or reinforce the grammatical objectives introduced in the same unit. This pattern suggests writing as an instrument of formal language learning rather than a space for multimodal experimentation.

For instance, in the Grade 11 textbook in Unit 4, students are asked to complete writing tasks such as composing an email describing the contributions of Prithvi Narayan Shah to the unification of Nepal and writing paragraphs based on a table outlining major political movements in Nepal following the end of the Rana regime (38). Both tasks require students to narrate past events, drawing explicitly on the use of past tense forms. Correspondingly, the grammar section in the same unit introduces the past simple tense and includes exercises on using correct verb forms. A similar pattern is evident in other units. For example, following grammar instruction on adjectives, students in Unit 5 are required to write about an interesting dream that they have had (48). This parallel structuring of writing and grammar instruction suggests that writing activities are designed to reinforce grammatical accuracy within extended prose.

The same pattern is evident in the Grade 12 English textbook. For example, students in Unit 17, are required to compose a letter to their friend describing about their recent travel experience by bus or train (146). The grammar section in the same unit teaches students different aspects of past tense such as past simple, past continuous, past perfect and past perfect continuous tense (146). Likewise, different forms of passive voice are introduced in Unit 11 to students to support composing an essay on the advantages of walking (92-93). In these instances, writing tasks operate as sites for applying specific grammatical structures introduced within the same unit.

At the same time, there are many instances across both the textbooks where grammar instruction and writing tasks are not closely aligned and sometimes there are complete mismatches between writing tasks and grammar sections. For instance, in the Grade 11 English textbook, the diary-writing task in Unit 10 (95) is not directly connected with the unit's grammar section on connectives (but, however, although/even though, in spite of / despite), and the essay on “War and Peace” in Unit 15 (141) does not directly align with the unit's focus on parts of a sentence (subject, verb, object, complement, adverbial). Similarly, in the Grade 12 English textbook, grammar instruction on adjective order in Unit 20 is remotely connected with the composition on racial or sexual discrimination or the status of women in Nepali society (175-176), and grammar section “Past habitual” (would/used to) in Unit 19 lacks an alignment with interpreting charts and diagrams (166-167).

Despite this lack of alignment between writing tasks and grammar sections, the recurrent pairing of writing tasks with grammatical instruction reflects the tendency to conceptualize writing as a means of practicing grammatical accuracy within extended prose. This conceptualization of writing as a print-based and grammar-oriented practice shapes not only what forms of writing are emphasized in the curriculum, but also what forms of meaning-making are excluded from the institutional definition of writing. This framing provides an important context for examining the status of multimodal composition within the curriculum.

Multimodality as a Topic rather than Mode of Writing

Although Nepal's Grade 11 and 12 English curriculum engage with diverse texts and media, writing continues to be conceptualized primarily as alphabetic, grammar-oriented prose. As a result, multimodal composition is not institutionally recognized as writing within the language section of the curriculum, even when students are asked to engage with multimodal texts. Importantly, this does not indicate a complete absence of multimodal composition in the textbook. Multimodal compositions such as email, news story, film review, para-orthographic texts, press release are included across both the textbooks. However, students are asked to compose these multimodal texts through conventional written genres. For example, for film review, the instruction in Unit 18 is, "Write a review of a film you have recently watched" (*English Grade 11* 167); for graphs and charts, the instruction in Unit 20 is to write paragraphs interpreting the visuals (*English Grade 11* 186); and for a press release, the instruction in Unit 4 is to write a press release as the General Manager of Nepal Airlines about the cancellation of flights to the mountain regions due to the poor weather condition (*English Grade 12* 32). In these cases, multimodal resources serve as source material or prompts, while writing itself remains defined as linear, alphabetic text production.

Importantly, activities that involve visual or multimodal compositions such as poster presentations (*English Grade 11* 12), making a profile (*English Grade 11* 108), picture story (*English Grade 11* 144), brochure (*English Grade 11* 180), informative report (*English Grade 12* 129), internet surfing on the trade report of a particular day in Nepal Stock Exchange Limited (*English Grade 12* 139), are positioned under "Project Work" separate from the "Writing" column. This structural separation indicates an implicit curricular boundary between writing and other forms of communication. Students may encounter images, visuals, or media as the components of the curriculum, but these modes are not integrated into writing instruction as legitimate compositional resources. As a result, multimodal design is treated as supplementary rather than central to writing.

These patterns suggest that the Grade 11 and Grade 12 English curriculum maintains a narrow conception of writing that privileges linguistic expression through print-based genres, even as it engages with diverse semiotic forms at the level of content. The curriculum conceptualizes composition, to quote Lovett et al., as the product of "ink and paper" (288) and refuses to acknowledge, in Lunsford's term "technicolor" aspect of writing (xiii). Multimodal composition remains largely absent from the institutional definition of writing in the context of secondary education in Nepal.

My Early Interventionist Approach

It is important to acknowledge in the context of secondary education in Nepal, students are assessed through high-stakes yearly assessment systems, namely the Grade 11 Board Exam and the School Leaving Certificate (SLC) Examination at the end of Grade 12. These yearly examinations rely on paper-based written tests. As a result, students are required to show their writing competence through traditional alphabetic genres in final examination. This is the structural reality, and this reality has shaped curricular priorities and instructional practices. Furthermore, based on my nearly a decade teaching experience in secondary education in Nepal, I have also witnessed the large class size, limited institutional access to digital tools, lack of digital literacy among the teachers, and traditional teacher-centered pedagogy as the systemic constraints in the integration of multimodal composition in the classroom. While I advocate the structural reform of secondary English curricula as a necessary long-term goal, I also acknowledge the transformative change in education rarely happens overnight. However, waiting for the top-down policy revisions risks leaving the classrooms stuck in a print-centric loop. Then what options do we have? In response to this question, grounded in the present pedagogical and structural challenges, I recommend an early interventionist approach as teacher-led initiatives to multimodal composition. This early interventionist approach does not challenge the legitimacy of the examination system, nor does it suggest completely replacing alphabetic writing with multimodal composition.

I advocate this interventionist approach at two levels: the pedagogical and the evaluative level. At the pedagogical level, teachers can introduce the concept of remixing or remediation

assignment in the classroom. When a text is taken from one medium and revised into a text in a different medium, it is called remediation or remixing because the ideas and content of the text are being communicated through different media. In such assignments, teachers can encourage and guide students to present their alphabetic essays in multimodal forms. For instance, in Grade 11, students can remix their biography essay on a Nepal freedom fighter (84) in the form of video, podcast, brochures, zines, or infographics. Similarly, in Grade 12, students can be encouraged and guided to remix their film/book review alphabetic writing (75) into video projects. Such remixing of the assignments is something teachers can engage the students in the classroom without conflicting with the board exams. At the evaluative level, I emphasize that within an examination-driven system, the definition of writing in curriculum need not be limited to alphabetic prose alone, nor should multimodal composition be excluded from what counts as writing in instruction. Within the existing structure of Grade 11 and Grade 12 English, students' academic performance is evaluated through a combination of external examination and internal assessment, with the final examination carrying 75 marks and the remaining 25 marks allocated to internal assessment. I plug in my interventionist approach in this grading system arguing that multimodal writing can be meaningfully and realistically integrated through internal assessment. Students could be encouraged to compose and submit multimodal compositions as part of the allocated 25 internal marks. Such an approach allows alphabetic writing to continue to be assessed through formal examinations while simultaneously recognizing multimodal meaning-making within instructional and evaluative practices. In this way, multimodal composition is not positioned as a replacement for traditional writing, but as an expansion of what writing can represent in curricular contexts, aligned with contemporary literacy practices and responsive to local assessment realities.

Toward a Nepali Multiliteracies: A Call for Action

Nearly three decades have passed since the New London Group (NLG) first championed "multiliteracies" as a necessary response to a rapidly changing communicative landscape. Since then, the global field of composition has undergone a "multimodal turn," redefining writing as a multimodal composition rather than a mere alphabetic exercise. Yet, as this study demonstrates, the secondary English curriculum in Nepal remains anchored in a print-centric past, seemingly insulated from these global shifts. As it stands, multimodal composition in the Nepali curriculum is currently a latent possibility rather than a pedagogical reality. It is trapped in the 'internal assessment' section, waiting for a collective voice to activate it. This state of latency raises urgent questions for the future of Nepali education: Who will serve as the collective voice for a Nepali 'multiliteracies' movement? How can we theorize a version of multimodality grounded in Nepal's local pedagogical and assessment realities? And, most importantly, how much longer can our educational system remain silent while students engage with a world that has long since moved beyond the alphabetic and the monomodal? While the road toward a truly multimodal framework in Nepal is long, the first step is acknowledging that our current definition of 'writing' is no longer enough.

Works Cited

- Acharya, Shiva Lal. *Multiliteracy in Basic Education: A Comparative Study Between Finland and Nepal*. Master's thesis, Åbo Akademi University, 2025.
- Adhikari, Bal Ram. "Student Teachers' Views on Grammar and the Teaching of Grammar, and Its Communication to Their Students." *Journal of NELTA*, vol. 22, nos. 1–2, 2017, pp. 88–101. <https://doi.org/10.3126/nelta.v22i1-2.20044>
- Baral, Raj Kumar, Laxman Bhatta, and Som Nath Ghimire. "Emergency Remote Teaching in Nepali Higher Education Institutions during COVID-19." *Distance Education*, vol. 45, no. 1, 2024, pp. 6–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2024.2303490>.
- Bhusal, Purna Chandra, and Hem Lal Pandey. "Enacting Anti-Discriminatory Pedagogy in Compulsory English Classrooms in Grades XI and XII in Nepal: Challenges and Possibilities." *KMC Journal*, vol. 7, no. 2, 2025, pp. 13–26. <https://doi.org/10.3126/kmcj.v7i2.83433>

- English Grade 11*. Curriculum Development Centre, Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, Government of Nepal, 2020.
- English Grade 12*. Curriculum Development Centre, Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, Government of Nepal, 2021.
- Ghimire, Nani Babu. "Application of Multiliteracies Pedagogy in Teaching English at Early Grades in Nepal." *Journal of NELTA*, vol. 25, nos. 1–2, 2020, pp. 92–116.
<https://doi.org/10.3126/nelta.v25i1-2.49733>
- Kessler, Matt, and Francisco Marino. "Digital Multimodal Composing in English Language Teaching." *ELT Journal*, vol. 77, no. 3, 2023, pp. 370–376.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccac047>
- Kress, Gunther. *Multimodality: A Social Semiotic Approach to Contemporary Communication*. Routledge, 2010.
- Lovett, Michael, et al. "Writing with Video: What Happens When Composition Comes Off the Page?" In *RAW: Reading and Writing New Media*, edited by Cheryl E. Ball and Jim Kalmbach, Hampton Press, 2010, pp. 287–304.
- Lunsford, Andrea A. *Writing Matters: Rhetoric in Public and Private Lives*. University of Georgia Press, 2007.
- Neupane, Ram Nath. "Grammar Instruction in English Language Classrooms of Nepal: Approaches, Practices, and Challenges." *Vox Batauli*, vol. 10, no. 1, 2025, pp. 81–93.
<https://doi.org/10.3126/vb.v10i1.87368>
- Palmeri, Jason. *Remixing Composition: A History of Multimodal Writing Pedagogy*. Southern Illinois University Press, 2012.
- Pandey, Hem Lal, and Sanjeev Niraula. "Perpetuation of Casteism through Proverbs: A Critical Discourse Analysis." *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, vol. 6, no. 4, 2024, pp. 611–22. <https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v6i4.2001>
- Paudyal, Ganga Ram, and Karna Rana. "How University Lecturers and Students Interpret Opportunities and Challenges of Online Mode of Learning." *International Journal of Research in Education and Science*, vol. 7, no. 4, 2021, pp. 1006–22.
<https://doi.org/10.46328/ijres.2383>
- Saldaña, Johnny. *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. SAGE Publications, 2013.
- Selfe, Cynthia L. "Toward New Media Texts: Taking Up the Challenges of Visual Literacy." In *Writing New Media: Theory and Applications for Expanding the Teaching of Composition*, edited by Anne Frances Wysocki, Johndan Johnson-Eilola, Cynthia L. Selfe, and Geoffrey Sirc, Utah State University Press, 2004, pp. 67–110.
- Shakya, Subarna, Gajendra Sharma, and Kamal B. Thapa. "State Education System with E-Learning in Nepal: Impact and Challenges." *Journal of the Institute of Engineering*, vol. 13, no. 1, 2017, pp. 10–19. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jie.v13i1.20344>
- Shipka, Jody L. *Toward a Composition Made Whole*. University of Pittsburgh Press, 2011.
- Takayoshi, Pamela, and Cynthia L. Selfe. "Thinking about Multimodality." *Multimodal Composition: Resources for Teachers*, edited by Cynthia L. Selfe, Hampton Press, 2007, pp. 1–12.
- Thapa, Devinder, and Maung K. Sein. "An Ecological Model of Bridging the Digital Divide in Education: A Case Study of OLPC Deployment in Nepal." *The Electronic Journal of Information Systems in Developing Countries*, vol. 84, no. 2, 2018, e12018.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/isd2.12018>
- The New London Group. "A Pedagogy of Multiliteracies: Designing Social Futures." *Harvard Educational Review*, vol. 66, no. 1, 1996, pp. 60–92.
- Timsina, Jib Nath. "Teaching English in Nepal and Its Space in Secondary Level Curriculum." *Tribhuvan University Journal*, vol. 38, no. 1, 2023, pp. 88–107.
<https://doi.org/10.3126/tuj.v38i01.56208>