

Introducing Discourse-Based English Teaching in Pakistan: The Systemic-Functional Grammar and Visual Grammar Perspectives

Muhammad Aslam^{1*}, Syed Danish Nasir²

Abstract

In Pakistan, English is taught as a second language at all tiers of education. But the goal of a desirable discourse competence has never been attained despite several attempts to overhaul syllabus and material development process. The purpose of this reflective paper is to explore an approach to English that will invigorate the efforts being made to develop discourse competence of Pakistani learners. Communication is developed through communication and a concrete model of communication was offered by Halliday in form of his Systemic-Functional grammar. The model has successfully been employed in Australia, Asia, Europe, and even USA. As communication is rapidly shifting to multi-modal means, Visual Grammar is also worthwhile in suggesting the way out to deal with new communicative challenges faced by Pakistani learners of English. To achieve this purpose, an overview of the notion of discourse, main developments in the field of discourse, models of integration of discourse studies with English Education, possibilities and challenges in implementing discourse oriented practices in English learning in Pakistan were discussed with a critical and professional lens. The reflection on the purposefully selected literature reveals that a shift to the discourse paradigm is inevitable for developing discourse competence of the learners. The deliberations in the paper conclude with suggestions for planning and implementation of discourse based English teaching in Pakistan.

Keywords: Systemic-Functional Grammar, discourse competence, multi-genre texts, visual grammar, English teaching in Pakistan.

¹ Assistant Professor, Department of ELT & Linguistics, IER, University of the Punjab, Lahore

² MPhil Applied Linguistics (Scholar), Department of English, University of Central Punjab, Lahore.

*Corresponding author's E-mail: aslam.ier@pu.edu.pk

Available online: 25-03-2024

This is an open-access article.

Introduction

The current is the age of multimodal texts and multi-literacies which challenges the dominance of the verbal mode and related linguistic discourse analysis traditions (Stonecipher, 2020; Gee, 2018; Rose, 2016). These developments, among others, have impacted literacy practices and language teaching. In Pakistan, English teaching at all tiers still needs to be more consistent with traditional language modes for teaching literacy skills and literature. Consequently, this approach deprives the learners of understanding the entire process that produced the texts. The purpose of this review paper is to get an insight into this problem regarding Pakistan in the light of research and practices utilized around certain parts of the world. The primary objectives of the current review include exploring a research-based foundation to ascertain discourse-based teaching of English in Pakistan; highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of the multimodal approach to ELT; suggesting alternatives to the conventional linguistic strategies for English teaching; and highlighting the prospects and problems for implementation.

[These opening lines highlight that the context of reflections is English teaching situation in Pakistan].

Rising Interest in Discourse Analysis

Jaworski (2020) surmises that recent interest in discourse is the result of two simultaneous developments: the "linguistic turn" in epistemology, whose central belief is that language is the crucial ingredient in the constitution of knowledge. The other is the broadening of the "inward-looking discipline" of Linguistics. These perspectives now have started looking beyond the sentence and considering the interrelationship between language, meaning, and society. These developments have broadened the scope of Discourse Analysis (DA onwards) beyond the interpretation and discussion of meaning-making to the ideology critique and the meaning system and discourse network. Because of this expansion, the field of Discourse Analysis has become interdisciplinary and no more a property of linguistics (Fairclough, 2020; Rubio, 2020).

Developments in the Discourse Studies

Chouliaraki and Fairclough (2022) emphasize that discourse analysis was conducted using mono-modal approaches based on linguistic or visual analysis to interpret the genre texts. However, a multimodal approach has recently emerged that is complementary in nature as it sees how different

“semiosis” (modes) affect meaning when they interact with each other in multimodal texts such as films, museums, displays, and computational texts. In a historic survey of discourse analysis from spoken discourse to multimodal analysis, Lwin (2022) proposed that DA originated from Sociolinguistics and focused only on language use above the sentence and remained confined to talk (spoken discourse). Then under the banner of text grammar, it took up cohesion in written texts as its focus. In another development, it made social critique its main concern under Critical Linguistics. Halliday’s Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) was used as a toolkit for this critique. Before Halliday, sentence-level rules were extended to analyze only texts, but after his notion of language as social semiotics, the analysis framework was also changed. In a further development, text features were related to its social and institutional contexts and the associated politics, ideologies, and world views. This development led to Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA onwards). Halliday provided methods of relating texts with ideologies in his “Discourse Semantics” framework (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2013, p. 35).

Chen (2010) encompasses Fairclough’s work as a breakthrough in the history of discourse analysis, emphasizing a synthesis of Halliday’s DA, French Philosophy, and Russian Literary Analysis. Lemke related DA with Communication Theories and the work of van Leeuwen, Hodge, Kress, and O’ Tool (Sydney Semiotics Circle). In 2005, Leeuwen related DA to semiosis other than language (visual, audial, and spatial). These works may be regarded as early attempts to introduce Multimodal Discourse Analysis, which has established now as a field of research within the umbrella of discourse analysis (Gu & Catalano, 2022; O’Halloran, 2022; Smith & Sheyholislami, 2022). With the advent of multimodal discourse analysis, “the traditional divisions between language-oriented analyses, Saussure’s semiology, and sign system-oriented semiotics” disappeared.

Presently, in the field of DA, two analytical approaches dominate: one is a critical framework originating mainly from the work of Fairclough, and the other is a multimodal framework originating from the Sydney Circle (Fie, 2004). Fie (2004) considers that the multi-semiotic developments in film, TV, computer, and the internet hugely contributed to multimodality. Ning (2022) draws attention to the fact that the weakening of the cultural, political, and economic boundaries under globalization led to the weakening of semiotic boundaries. Some discourse researchers attached these developments to post-modernity (e.g., Calhoun et al., 2022; Li, 2016).

Conceptual Framework of Multimodality

Ledin and Machin (2020) endorse Fie (2004), who opines that “we live in a multimodal society which makes meaning through the co-deployment of a combination of semiotic resources” (p.220). Barton (2009) also supports the same view when he says that “we live in a textually mediated social world where texts are the part of the glue of social life” (p.38). For him, understanding contemporary life only by understanding texts is problematic (see Krippendorf, 2020, for more on it).

Multimodality may refer to using more than one mode or semiotic system in the same text context in an integrated or complementary manner. Fie (2004) employs the term “intra-semiosis” for this co-occurrence. However, it is also used for the transition of the exact text from one mode to another in different contexts, which is called “re-semiotization” (Iedema, 2003, p.41) or “inter semiosis” (Fie, 2004, p.221) or reconstruction of reality”, “semantic reconstruals” (O’Halloran, 2022, p. 23). Now the question arises of why texts should be multimodal or multi-semiotic. Iedema (2003) remarks that multimodality provides means to describe a practice or representation in all its semiotic complexity and richness. Notably, a multimodal account does not a priori privilege any semiotic over the other, although the practice itself may foreground one particular one. The foregrounding of one is often accompanied (or achieved) by the backgrounding or “automatization” (Halliday, 1982, p.45) of other semiotic to the point where they appear so normal and natural as to become invisible (pp.39-40).

Slembrouck (2009) and Harder (2009) substantiated Iedema (2003) and asserted that verbal mode foregrounds the others because of a particular place of human language and the traditional dichotomy of channels as speech or writing, too, reinforces the same conception. Kress (2004) and Iedema (2003) insinuate that from an occasional interest in other semiotic modes, this foregrounding turns to a norm where all texts are seen as multimodal and are described in that way. Language is likely to be part of these semiotic objects, though it might not and often it might not be the dominant or most significant mode. Zhao (2010) calls the study of resemiotization a significant development in Modal Discourse Analysis (MDA). This discussion shows that multimodality may refer to the exact text as multimodal, a combination of modes or transition of the text from one mode to the other in different contexts. The last usage, resemiotization by Iedema (2003), needs some illustration.

Iedema (2003), based on his studies (1997, 2000, 2001), has operationalized resemiotization of texts through applications from the fields of education, technological gadgets, and architecture. He explains how one semiotic shift to another in chronically related sequenced transitions. These transitions are not reversible; each transition leads to a reconstruction of reality, reorganization of "social space," or "re-materialization" (p. 547). Bazerman and Kress (2008) used the term "transformation" to refer to changes in representation within the same mode and "transduction" to refer to changes across the modes (p. 169). Transduction, reconstruction, or re-materialization involves new semiosis (linguistic, non-linguistic), new meanings, new importance, and new resources and gradually "divorces" the text from its original context. Iedema thinks that the meaning-making process involves inter-semiotic shifts, and understanding a text in its final representation requires understanding its whole semiotic history. He explains this process with an example of the plan of a health facility. The plan was first discussed face to face in a meeting (spoken semiosis). It became an executive summary and was approved (written semiosis (s) and finally resemiotized as architectural design (non-linguistic semiosis).

Ledin and Machin (2020) and Iedema (2003) responded, based on their reviews of studies, that each semiotic (roughly mode) has its constraints, and to overcome them, shifts to other semiosis become necessary. What language can do, pictures cannot do, and vice versa. Nevertheless, resemiotization can take place if each semiotic can provide "unproblematic, transparent, and direct translation for the meanings made in another semiotic" (pp.47-48) and acknowledges that such "semiotic equations" are always tricky. Semiosis, however, may be set to have the "division of labours" ability to complement each other in the meaning-making process (p.48). This discussion leads to the conclusion that texts are not mono-modal in nature, so more than simple linguistic analysis is needed. For a balanced understanding, a shift towards multimodal discourse analysis seems invertible.

Chen (2010) yields Halliday the credit for redefining the philosophic notion of modality (context-independent truth of assertion) as social modality-- a social, interpersonal, and shared truth in his meta-functional theory of language (see Webster's edited collections of Halliday, 2003). Based on Halliday and Hasan, Unsworth (2008, pp.1-27) points out that Halliday's theory has enabled social semiotics to see "culture as totality of all meaning-making modes". Chen (2010) introduced this notion of social modality in a study of multimodal textbooks taught at primary and secondary levels in China and concluded that multimodal analysis could

enable the analyst to identify the modality (social truth) conveyed through textbooks as absolute or shared.

Issues with Multimodal Discourse Analysis

Zhao (2010) traces the origin of multimodal discourse analysis (MDA onwards) in the classic works of Kress and Leeuwen (1996, 2006) and O' Toole (1994). Further, he finds its theoretical underpinning in Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL onwards) (also O' Halloran, 2022; Fie, 2010). Before the discussion is turned to the framework of analysis, some essential issues encountered by MDA need particular attention. Zhao (2010) noted that for SFL use in MDA, a reconceptualization of *rank* was necessary. Maagero et al. (2021) illustrate that the rank/constituency model (morpheme, word, phrase, clause) takes texts as a product of clauses. In contrast, the multimodal text is not just the total of smaller units of text and images; instead, "it is a meaning-making process in which choice from one semiotic system is constantly coupling with or developing from the choice made in another system" (p. 25). This concept of the text is the first step in MDA.

There is also an issue at the methodological level. Ontologically, language and other semiosis represent reality differently. Besides, when multimodal texts are analyzed, language-based metalanguage is used. This results in the meaninglessness of preference for one semiosis over the other because language cannot be avoided. So, the biggest challenge MDA practitioners face is the metalanguage that can capture the dynamic nature of multimodal discourse and human semiosis (roughly communication) in general (Zhao, 2010; Fie, 2004).

Gee (2014) argues that discourse analysis involves asking and answering questions. These questions are the toolkit for analysis, emphasizing at the same time the need for social validity for this analysis (validity across researchers). Gee says that this discourse is primarily communication, and humans can communicate via language, other sign systems, or both. So, the analytical method suggested by him for linguistic discourse analysis can be adopted for multimodal analysis.

Visual Grammar in Multimodal Discourse Analysis

Fie (2004) suggested that to cover both text and hypertext MDA, an interdisciplinary approach should be followed based on linguistics, visual communication studies, and media studies. This model is a meta-model that integrates SFL with other models and is called Integrative Multi-Semiotic Model (IMM) (for detail see O' Halloran, 2008). This model

applies to two semiotic resources, language and visual images. Each semiotic system has three levels/planes, which are mediated by the medium and materiality of the text, expression, content, and context. *The expression* level consists of typography, language choices, and graphic choices for images. *The content* plane consists of lexico-grammar and discourse semantics for language and visual grammar for images; the *context* plane consists of register, genre, and ideology for both language and image. Here, the semiotic interface takes place. This integration results in the expansion of meaning or using Lemke's (1998) term "multiplication of meaning" or Royce et al.'s (2007) term "inter-semiotic complementarity" or Fie's (2004) term "inter-semiosis" or Kress's (2004) term "transduction".

Further, O' Halloran (2004) explains that this integration simultaneously expands meaning at all three planes. However, he admits that fully understanding what and how this expansion in meaning-making is still possible. This problem arises out of two possibilities "co-contextualization", when there is a convergence between the semiotic system, and "re-contextualization," if there is divergence. (For concrete examples of the application of this interdisciplinary approach (see Krippendorff & Halabi, 2020).

Van Leeuwen (2005) contributed to MDA methodology by suggesting four ways to identify cohesion in multimodal text and communicative events:

- **Rhythm:** It refers to a composition in time that provides cohesion in conversations, oral story, telling, music, acting, dance, film, and television.
- **Layout:** It refers to a composition in space that provides cohesion in pages, screens, paintings, museum exhibits, and building sites. (here, composition means the arrangement of elements).
- **Information linking** is verbal linking (explicit or implicit) provided through conjunctions. There is visual and verbal-visual linking (found in non-linear multimodal texts (that can be linked in any order). In the latter case, linking is provided through *elaboration*--- when the same information is added to the previous by different modes and mediums and through *extensions* ---when new information is added to the previous by different modes and mediums.
- **Dialogue** refers to the cohesion provided through exchange structures (adjacency pairs). They are sequential, and sequences (turns or moves) can be multimodal and simultaneous. However,

such sequencing is prominent in spoken discourse and simultaneously in music.

Multimodal Analysis in English Teaching

These models are essential as they show a path to future researchers, but such models only go beyond the composition of multimodal texts. There was still a need to devise models for step-by-step analysis both for research and teaching, which was fulfilled adequately by the analytic models of Baldry and Thibault (2010). They have presented methods of transcription and analysis of print pages, web pages, and films. Another mentionable model, which specifically meets the needs of stylistic analysis, was proposed by Norgaard (2019). Norgaard has grounded her work in Halliday's social semiotic theory of language that encompasses all meaning-bearing modes, including language. The theory says that a clause conveys three meanings simultaneously: experiential or ideational, interpersonal, and textual. As a result, the analysis of longer texts, literary/non-literary, became possible. She credited Kress and Leeuwen (1996, 2006) for extending this approach to multi-semiotic discourse analysis. The authors suggest visual communication occurs between "represented participants" and "interactive participants" through images. For them, images have their grammar and syntax. Norgaard (2018) suggested a toolkit for the stylistic analysis of novels by exploiting these semiotic and multimodal perspectives.

However, Norgaard's (2018) toolkit can be used as a step-by-step method of teaching multiliteracies and multimodal or, more broadly, multi-semiotic texts, and even researching all dimensions of meaning involved in a multimodal or single modal text. This framework can be adopted in Pakistani classrooms as its components do not demand learning of different teaching skills, except a change in outlook about the textual meaning. She has divided the toolkit into different modes, including wording, visuals (photography and drawing), typography (handwriting, calligraphy, printing, and color), layout (informational structure, salience, and framing), and materiality (cover, paper, and binding). Researchers can combine Rose's (2016) method of researching visual materials with Norgaard's analytic framework for all strands of discourse analysis, including critical discourse analysis.

Ravelli (2019) utilized Royce's (1998) model to suggest pedagogical strategies for image analysis in university classes. The researcher made this choice because Royce's model related meta-functions of language with visual and verbal meanings of the text for critical multimodal analysis of

texts. This model contained almost all the details proposed by Norgaard for multimodal stylistic analysis of literary texts. Ravelli (2019) has proposed the following strategies:

Stage 1: Observe and describe (students look, respond, and discuss)

Stage2: Technicalize: (students identify core parts of the visual grammar)

Stage3: Technicalize again (students identify more delicate options in visual grammar)

Stage 4: Focus on foregrounded patterns: (students relate visual grammar analysis to the whole text and other texts).

Review of Research on Discourse-Based English Teaching

The following review of previous studies, mostly related to the pivotal models and studies, helped construct the discourse-based English teaching strategies. The areas covered included evaluation of multimodal contents of textbooks, traditional and digital text analyses, disciplinary limitations, assessment of multimodal analysis of texts, teachers' competence and skills for multimodal language pedagogy, and learning resources for discourse-based English teaching.

Chen (2010) used multimodal analysis for truth judgments about the primary and secondary textbooks of English teaching in China. Jamani (2011) provided a four-level framework for multimodal analysis of scientific discourse in classrooms of two physics teachers. The framework based on the social semiotic views of Halliday, Lemke, and Jamani was employed to compare two pedagogical approaches. These pedagogical approaches are expository (verbal) and multimodal. Norgaard (2018) claimed that though the field is still very young, it helps analyze multimodal literary texts like novels and dramas. It is being applied by multimodal stylisticians, however, with some problems, such as applying the apparatus of verbal language to visual semiotic resources.

Similarly, besides verbal mode, the grammar of visual images, layout, and typography are involved simultaneously. It shows that standard multimodal grammar needs to be improved.

Another critical issue is that academicians must be more expert in using all semiotic modes. However, Norgaard (2017, 2018) suggests that, initially, teachers and researchers can work with one or two modes, or the cooperation of experts in other modes can temporarily solve this problem.

Jewitt & Jones (2008, pp.159-160) point out that the multimodal approach is laborious and time-consuming, yet it provides teachers/researchers with “powerful analytical tools” to explore, even taboos. Kell (2009) says that the work in the field of multimodality does not yet have any adequate theorization of practices” (p.79).

Astroga (2009) reviewed studies of specialists in literacy education. He thinks that if students are to become an effective participants in emerging multiliteracies. They need to understand how language, image, and digital rhetoric resources can be deployed independently and interactively to construct different kinds of meaning (also see Jones et al., 2015, pp.1-17). Archer (2006) argues that the visual/verbal distinction should be abolished, and a multimodal approach to academic literacy in fields like Engineering should be adopted to understand the relationship between technologies and society. His observations are based on a study of return reports and visual posters submitted by his Engineering students for a communication course.

Further, Archer (2006) suggested that, like multimodal pedagogy, multimodal assessment practices should be promoted as the researcher himself successfully followed them in the students’ assessment. However, he pointed out that multimodality has limited access to word-based fields like Humanities. So, Archer stresses that he does not advocate replacing existing literacy practices with multimodality but rather extending them to deal with the text and present "culture capitals" (knowledge) in different modes. Another observation of his is that “although all modes can realize all functions, they are pushed in certain directions by particular text and practices” such as feelings can be expressed better in visual mode than the verbal mode.

Jewitt (2008) agrees with Archer that it is wrong to ask, “what is best?” Instead, it should be “what is best for what purpose?” (p.327). She says reading and writing are multimodal, but print-based literacy still dominates education and disconnects school literacy from out-of-school worlds. Bazerman and Kress (2008) analyzed multimodal digital and print resources for secondary school English, Science, and Mathematics in England, used in 1930 and 2005. The comparison was made by selecting a persistent topic such as simile from English, digestion from Science, and angles from Mathematics. The authors concluded that the movement of meaning material from mode to mode resulted in re-contextualization that, in turn, was indicated by the participants' selection, arrangement, foregrounding, and social relations. Further, they also noted a decrease in domination of writing in textbooks.

Dimpoulos (2001) has discussed studies that applied a post-modernist perspective to multimodal pedagogy and related it with the cultural context of the educational institute (emphasized in SFL-MDA. Please see Victor, 2011), which is materialized by buildings, furniture, decorations, equipment, and wall displays. As noted earlier, multimodality is thought to have a post-modernist trajectory, and only if the material culture of the educational institute matches with post-modernity can multimodal pedagogy be practiced in language classrooms.

Guijarro and Sanz (2009) proposed a method for analyzing children's picture books based on Halliday, Nikolajera and Scott (2000,2001). These analysts adopted this model because they think that Kress and Leeuwen's model (2005) analyzes verbal and visual modes independently without considering their interplay. The model they have proposed consists of the following categories for analysis:

- ***Symmetrical interaction***--- exists when words and images convey "the same story, repeating information through different forms of communication".
- ***Ideational complementarity***---exists if words and images represent different meanings but complement each other.
- ***Counterpointing interplay***--- exists if words and images provide alternative information and "collaborate to communicate meanings beyond the scope of either one standing alone."
- ***Contradictory interaction***--- exists if words and pictures represent entirely different.

Mathewman, Blight, and Davis (2004) and Unsworth (2008) argue that the use of multimodal pedagogy has now been established in academic circles, and English is "the prime site for innovation and development" (p.153). They say that the question faced by the practitioners has been how to respond to emerging "text form association with information and multimedia technologies". The researchers have found a response to this question in the New London Group's Model. This project was designed to investigate the impact of multimodal pedagogy on different subject areas, including English. The pedagogic model used in the case study as part of the project considered four steps:

- ***Situated practice***--- using design of meaning (modes) available at the workplaces.
- ***Overt instruction***--- direct teaching of modes with relevant meta language.
- ***Critical framing***--- thinking about social and cultural contexts associated with the modes.

- ***Transformed practice***--- the current mono-modal / practices are transformed into multimodal ones.

The researchers, however, have pointed out some hurdles in applying the New London Group's Model. First, the modes (designs of the meaning) are only involved in some situations, and a standard metalanguage for teachers and students is another issue. Then expertise in ICT is a prerequisite for such pedagogy. However, they suggest that to solve the problem of metalanguage, familiar categories can be taken from media studies and A-level courses. They conclude that “one might say the following with some confidence. Language-as-speech will remain the major mode of communication; language-as-writing will increasingly be replaced by the image in many domains of public communication, though writing will remain the preferred mode of the political and cultural elites” (Mathewman, Blight, & Davis, 2004, p.172).

Potential Strategies for Discourse-Based English Teaching in Pakistan

Drawing upon the theoretical perspective developed from the review of selected studies, implications for English teaching in Pakistan are being discussed now. First, as the field is yet nascent, teacher educators and universities should conduct classroom-based research to explore multimodality applications. Second, multimodal discourse-based pedagogy must be integrated into curriculum and teacher education. The work by Love (2008) and her colleagues at Melbourne University, Australia, can be an initiation. She has designed programs for teacher training in multimodal pedagogy. For a practical model, LASS (Literacy Across the School Subjects) DVD and BUILT (Building Understandings in Literacy and Teaching) CD ROM can be studied and trialed in Pakistan. This material has already been used in Australia, the UK, Indonesia, Denmark, and the UAE. (<http://extranet.edfac.unimelb.edu.au?LLAE/LASS/lass.html>). This active service encompasses digital literacy, standard written genres, multi-genre texts, oral language, and even science subjects (accessed on 3 January 2023).

The policymakers in Pakistan can also get insights from the experiences of those Asian countries which have introduced multimodal and multi-literacy/discipline-specific courses in their English teaching (e.g., Singapore's [2010] initiative was critically explored in Lin, Chia, & Nguyen, 2022). As the world is moving towards digitization of communication and English teaching is not immune to its effects, Pakistani teachers can exploit the use of social media applications by students of all

levels. Instagram, YouTube, Google Sites, Story-bird, Youth Voice, BBC Learning English, and Learn English Podcasts can be utilized for critical media literacy learning (CMLL) (Afrilyasanti, Basthomi, & Zen, 2022). However, the selection of materials for discourse-based teaching is of paramount importance. It will have to be assessed and adapted to Pakistan's cultural and practical context, for which proper guidelines may be taken from research (e.g., Haung, 2019). Martens, Balling, and Higgason (2022) offer an exciting and practical proposal for exploiting university students' interest in TikTok. The authors have suggested how reading can be a fun by relating students, books, and technology using #BookTokMadeMeReadIT.

[This whole section deals with the real issues whose solution is being explored in this paper].

Conclusion

In ELT, CLT (Communicative Language Teaching) needs to be more emphasized with understanding its preconditions for a country like Pakistan. It requires communicative slabs to develop discourse competence, which includes production and comprehension of discourse in real world encounters. For a discourse based English teaching, prospective teachers should have a thorough grounding in discourse analysis, pragmatics, and sociolinguistics. However, this is a postmodern world with multimodal texts, so multimodal literacies are the need of the hour. For this to happen, multimodal discourse analysis and multimodal pedagogy are inevitable. Before it comes to classrooms, such pedagogy needs a genre-based syllabus, digital classrooms, tech-savvy teachers, and multimodal learning materials such as drama, soap operas, and talk shows, simulated or recorded.

To implement these strategies in Pakistan, reconceptualization of communicative teaching is essential. It includes revisiting the syllabus, teaching materials, textual analysis, and effective interactive delivery in classrooms. Besides, to understand different pedagogical, curricular, and policy dimensions, more extensive and systematic review is recommended that should be followed by field-based collaborative case studies involving discourse analysts and English teachers from all tiers. Despite these limitations, the main contribution of this reflective paper is providing an adequate template of an alternative approach to English teaching in Pakistan that is needed to cope with communicative challenges in a post-modernist world.

[This, too, is all about Pakistan].

References

- Afrilyasanti, R., Basthomi, Y., & Zen, E. L. (2022). Turning up a CMLL Toolbox: Analyzing Web-Based Applications for Critical Media Literacy Learning. Interactive. *Technology and Smart Education*. (19(4). pp. 544-567. Doi: 10.1108/TTSE-07-2022-0088.
- Archer, A. (2006). Multimodal Approaches to Academic Literacies: Problematizing the Visual/Verbal Divide. *Language and Education*, 20 (6). Doi: 10.2167/le677.0
- Astorga, M. C. (2009). The Text-Image Matching: One Story, Two Textualizations. In E. Vertola & Guijaro (Eds.), *The World Told and The World Shown: Multi-Semiotic Issues* (pp. 124-138). Palgrave-MacMillan.
- Baldry, A. & Thibault, P. J. (2010). *Multimodal Transcription and Text Analysis: A Multimedia Toolkit and Course-book*. London: Equinox.
- Barton, D. (2009). Understanding Textual Practices in Changing World. In M. Baynham & M. Prinslod (Eds.), *The Future of Literacy Studies*. (pp. 38-53). Palgrave-MacMillan.
- Bazerman, J. & Kress, G. (2008). Writing in Multimodal Texts: A social Semiotic Account of Designs for Learning. *Western Communication*, 25 (2). pp. 166-195). Doi: 101177/074/1088.30
- Borba, M. C., O'Halloran, K. L., & Neves, L. X. (2022). Multimodality, Systemic Functional-Multimodal Discourse Analysis and Production of Videos in Mathematics Education. In *Handbook of Cognitive Mathematics* (pp. 909-938). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Calhoun, C., Gerteis, J., Moody, J., Pfaff, S., & Virk, I. (Eds.). (2022). *Contemporary sociological theory*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Chen, Y. (2010). Contestable Reality: A Multimodal View in Multimodal Pedagogic Context. In A. Mahboob, & N.K. Knight (Eds.), *Applicable Linguistics*. (pp. 221-233). Continuum.
- Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (2022). Discourse in late modernity. In *Discourse in Late Modernity*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Dimopoulos, K. (2011). Signifying the Transition from Modern to Post-Modern Schooling through Analyzing Changes in the Material Cultures of Schools. In S. C. Hamel (Ed.), *Semiotics: Theory and Applications*. (pp. 1-35). NY: NOVA
- Fairclough, N. (2020). Language and Discourse. In *Language in Use* (pp. 234-241). Routledge.
- Fie, V. L. (2004). Developing an Integrative Multisemiotic Model. In K. L. O'Halloran (Ed.), *Multimodal Discourse Analysis: Systemic Functional Perspectives*. (pp. 220-246). Continuum.
- Gee, J. P. (2014). *How to Do Discourse Analysis? A Toolkit*. Routledge.

- Gee, J. P. (2018). *Introducing Discourse Analysis: From Grammar to Society*. Routledge.
- Gu, X., & Catalano, T. (2022). Representing transition experiences: A multimodal critical discourse analysis of young immigrants in children's literature. *Linguistics and Education*, 71, 101083.
- Guijarro, A. J. M., & Sanz, M. J. P. (2009). On Interaction of Image and Verbal Text in a Picture Book: A Multimodal and Systemic Functional Study. In E. Ventola & A.J.M. Guijarro (Eds.), *The World Told and the World Shown: Multisemiotic Issues* (pp. 107-123). Palgrave-MacMillan.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. (2013). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar*. Routledge.
- Harder, P. (2009). Communication. In J. Verschueren & J. Ostman (Eds.), *Key Notions for Pragmatics*. (pp. 62-85). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Huang, Shin-Ying. (2018). A Critical Multimodal Framework for Reading and Analyzing Pedagogical Materials. *English Teaching: Practice & Critique*. 18(1). pp. 52-69. Doi: 10.1108/ETTPC-08-2018-0078.
- Iedema, R. (2003). Multimodality, Resemiotization, Practice: Extending the Analysis of Discourse as Multisemiotic. *Visual Communication*, 2 (29). Pp. 29-57. Doi: 10.1177/14700357203002001751
- Jamani, K. J. (2011). A Semiotic Discourse Analysis Framework: Understanding Meaning Making in Science Education Contexts. In S. C. Hamel (Ed.), *Semiotics: Theory and Applications*. (pp. 191-208). NY: NOVA
- Jaworski, A. (2020). Multimodal writing: The avant-garde assemblage and other minimal texts. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 17(3), 336-360.
- Jewitt, C. & Jones, K. (2008). Multimodal Discourse Analysis: The Case of 'Ability' in UK Secondary School English. In V. K. Bhattia, J. Flowerdew, & R. H. Jones (Eds.), *Advances in Discourse Studies*. (pp. 149-160). Routledge.
- Jones, R. H., Chik, A. & Hafner, C. A. (2015). (Eds.). *Discourse and Digital Practices: Doing Discourse Analysis in the Digital Age*. Routledge.
- Kell, C. (2009). Literacy Practices, Text (s) and Meaning Making Process Across Time and Space. In M. Baynham & M. Prinslod (Eds.), *The Future of Literacy Studies*. (pp. 75-99). Palgrave-MacMillan.
- Kress, G., & Van Leeuwen, T. (2020). *Reading images: The grammar of visual design*. Routledge.
- Kress, G. (2004). Reading Images: Multimodality, Representation and New Media. *Information Design*, 12 (2). pp. 110-119. Retrieved from

- Krippendorff, K. & Halabi, N. (2020). (Eds.). *Discourses in Action: What Language Enables us to Do?* Routledge.
- Lemke, J. L. (1998). Teaching all the languages of Science: Words, symbols, images, and actions. In *Conference on science education in Barcelona*.
- Li, Y. (2016). Cross-political pan-commercialism in the postmodern age and proposed readjustment of semiotic practices. *Semiotica*, 2016(213), 365-396.
- Lin, F. V., Chia, A. & Nguyen, T.T.H. (2022). "From the Beginning I think it was a Stretch"-Teachers' Perceptions and Practices in teaching Multiliteracies. *English Teaching Practice & Critique* (21(4), pp. 379-396. Doi: 10.1108/ETPC-01-2021-0025.
- Love, K. (2008). Literacy Across the School Subjects: A Multimodal Approach. In L. Unsworth (Ed.), *Multimodal Semiotics: Analysis in Context of Education*. (pp. 171-186). Continuum.
- Lwin, S. M. (2022). Discourse analysis. In *Research Anthology on Applied Linguistics and Language Practices* (pp. 1573-1595). IGI Global.
- Maagerø, E., Mulvad, R., & Tønnessen, E. S. (2021). *Women in Social Semiotics and SFL: Making a Difference*. Routledge.
- Martens, M., Balling, G., & Higgason, K. A. (2022). #BookTokMadeMeReadIT: Young Adult Reading Communities Across an International Socio-technical Landscape. *Information and Learning Sciences*. 123 (11/12). pp. 705-722. Doi: 10.1108/ILS-07-2022-0086.
- Mathewman, S. Blight, A., Davies, C. (2004). What does Multimodal Means for English? Creative Tensions in Teaching New Texts and New Literacies. *Education, Communication & Information*. pp. 153-176. Doi: 10.1080/1463631042000210944
- Ning, W. (2022). *After Postmodernism*. Taylor & Francis.
- Norgaard, N. ((2019). *Multimodal Stylistics of the Novel: More than Words*. Routledge.
- Nørgaard, N. (2017). Multimodality and stylistics. In *The Routledge handbook of stylistics* (pp. 489-502). Routledge.
- Nørgaard, N. (2018). *Multimodal stylistics of the novel: More than words*. Routledge.
- O'Halloran, K. L. (2004). Introduction, In K.L. Halloran (Ed.), *Multimodal Discourse Analysis: Systemic Functional Perspectives*. (pp. 1-10). Continuum.
- O'Halloran, K. (2022). Critical discourse analysis and language cognition. In *Critical Discourse Analysis and Language Cognition*. Edinburgh University Press.

- Ravelli, L. (2019). Pedagogical Strategies for Developing Interpretive Language about Images: A Tertiary Experience. *English Teaching: Practice & Critique*. 18(1). Pp. 11-118. Doi: 10.1108/ETTC-12-2017-0173.
- Rose, G. (2016). *Visual Methodologies: An Introduction to Researching with Visual Materials* (4th ed.). SAGE.
- Royce, T. D., Royce, T. D., & Bowcher, W. L. (2007). Intersemiotic complementarity: a framework for multimodal. *New directions in the analysis of multimodal discourse*, 63-109.
- Rubio, J. (2022). Educational language policy in massachusetts: Discourses of the look act. *Educational Policy*, 36(6), 1440-1463.
- Slembrouck, S. (2009). Channel. In Verschueren & J. Ostman (Eds.), *Key Notions for Pragmatics*. (pp. 48-61). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Smith, C., & Sheyholislami, J. (2022). Current Trends in Critical Discourse Studies of Textbooks: A Look at Selected Literature. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics/Revue canadienne de linguistique appliquée*, 25(1), 47-63.
- Stonecipher, R. (2020). Divergent Approaches to Discourse Analysis. In K. Krippendorff, & N. Halabi (Eds.), *Discourses in Action: What Language Enables us to Do?* Routledge.
- Unsworth, L. (2008). Multimodal Semiotic Analysis and Education. In L. Unsworth (Ed.), *Multimodal Semiotics: Analysis in Contexts of Education*. (pp. 1-14). Continuum.
- Van Leeuwen, T. (2005). *Introducing Social Semiotics*. Routledge.
- Victor, L. F. (2011). *A Systemic Functional Multimodal Discourse Analysis Approach to Pedagogic Discourse* [Doctoral Thesis]. National University of Singapore.
- Webster, J. (2003). (Ed.). *On Language and Linguistics* [MAK. Halliday]. Continuum.
- [www.knowledgerepresentation.org/building the future/.../Kress.html](http://www.knowledgerepresentation.org/building%20the%20future/.../Kress.html).
- Zhao, S. (2010). Rank in Visual Grammar: Some Implications for Multimodal Discourse Analysis. In A. Mahboob & NK. Knight (Eds.). *Applicable Linguistics*. (pp. 251-266). Continuum.