

SITUATED PRACTICE AND OVERT INSTRUCTION IN *AL-‘ARABIYYAH LI AL-NĀSYI’* IN VOLUME III: A MULTILITERACIES PEDAGOGY ANALYSIS

¹Amanda Resti Maulidiya, ^{1*}Asep Sopian, ¹Mia Nurmala, ²Ashinida Aladdin

¹Department of Arabic Language Education, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia

²School of Language Studies and Linguistics, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Malaysia

*Corresponding Author Email: asepsopian@upi.edu

Article Info	Abstract
Article History Received: June 2026 Revised: August 2026 Accepted: September 2026 Published: October 2026	<i>Arabic textbooks used in Indonesian pesantren and madrasah are rich in Arab-Islamic contexts, yet their pedagogical orientation has rarely been examined through contemporary literacy frameworks. This study aimed to map how Situated Practice (SP) and Overt Instruction (OI), within the four components of Multiliteracies Pedagogy, are represented in Al-‘Arabiyyah li al-Nāsyī’ in Volume III and how students perceive them. A sequential mixed-methods design (qualitative followed by quantitative) was applied. Qualitative content analysis covered 15 of 29 purposively selected thematic units (wahdah) using a 16-indicator rubric (inter-rater Cohen’s $\kappa = .82$), and a 10-item, four-point Likert questionnaire (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .796$) was administered to 46 Grade 10 students, with open-ended responses used to contextualize the ratings. The analysis produced 345 codable instances: OI accounted for 51.6%, SP for 25.2%, Transformed Practice for 23.2%, and Critical Framing for 0.0%. Students rated SP significantly above the scale midpoint ($M = 3.22$, $SD = 0.52$, $p < .001$), whereas OI ($M = 2.62$, $SD = 0.67$) did not differ from the midpoint ($p = .231$). Perceptions did not differ across self-reported proficiency levels ($H = 1.784$, $df = 2$, $p = .410$), although this comparison had low power because one group contained only two students. Within the sampled units, the textbook therefore combines strong explicit grammar scaffolding with contextualized dialogues, but offers limited Indonesian local context, no critical framing, and modest support for independent metalinguistic reflection. Teacher mediation and complementary tasks are needed when the textbook is used in Indonesian Islamic educational settings.</i>
Keywords Arabic textbook; <i>Al-‘Arabiyyah li al-Nāsyī’</i> in; Multiliteracies pedagogy; Overt instruction; Situated practice;	
How to cite: Las Maulidiya, A.R., Sopian, A., Nurmala, M., & Aladdin, A. (2026). Situated Practice and Overt Instruction in <i>Al-‘Arabiyyah Li Al-Nāsyī’</i> in Volume III: A Multiliteracies Pedagogy Analysis, <i>JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching</i> , 14(4), 1344-1357. Doi: https://doi.org/10.33394/joltt.v14i4.21413	

Copyright© 2026, Amanda Resti Maulidiya et al
This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) License



INTRODUCTION

The increasing complexity of communication in the twenty-first century has expanded literacy beyond reading and writing printed texts toward constructing meaning through linguistic, visual, audio, spatial, gestural, and digital modes (The New London Group, 1996; Cope & Kalantzis, 2013, 2016, 2023). This shift has implications for foreign-language education, where learning materials are expected not only to develop linguistic competence but also to connect learning with learners’ social, cultural, and communicative realities (Amgott, 2023; Lim, 2023). Textbooks are therefore not neutral repositories of language content; they mediate what learners encounter, what knowledge is made explicit, and how meaning-making is organized (Mohamed, 2024). Textbook analysis can reveal imbalances in

how learners encounter, conceptualize, analyze, and apply knowledge (Menke & Paesani, 2019), while visual resources contribute to disciplinary and cultural meaning (Guo & Feng, 2015). These issues are particularly relevant to Arabic education in pesantren and madrasah, where language learning intersects with Islamic knowledge, institutional practices, and cultural orientations. From a Multiliteracies Pedagogy perspective, Situated Practice (SP) and Overt Instruction (OI) are especially important because learners need meaningful contexts for engaging with knowledge and explicit support for understanding linguistic and semiotic resources.

In Indonesia, *Al-'Arabiyyah li al-Nāsyi'in* by Mahmud Ismail Shini and colleagues has been used in pesantren and madrasah for its systematic presentation of language skills, grammatical content, and Arabic-Islamic cultural materials (Roviin, 2018). Existing studies, however, have mainly addressed curriculum suitability, linguistic content, cultural representation, and feasibility (Halim, 2020; Muzayanah et al., 2025; Roviin, 2018), while broader Arabic textbook research has emphasized text difficulty, discourse features, organization, and content structure (Aldahmash & Alamri, 2020; Mohamed, 2024). These approaches establish what textbooks contain but provide less insight into how they position learners pedagogically, particularly whether activities connect with learners' experiences and whether knowledge is supported through explicit guidance and scaffolding. This gap has a practical dimension for Indonesian learners. The textbook presents dialogues, settings, and social practices that are richly Arab-Islamic, whereas Indonesian learners bring local lifeworlds that the material does not always reflect. Studies of English textbooks in Indonesia and internationally show that the balance between local and international cultural content is a persistent design issue that shapes how learners relate to the material (Setyono & Widodo, 2019; Shin et al., 2011). This matters in pesantren and madrasah, where Arabic learning may extend into institutional practices and Islamic knowledge. Evidence from an Indonesian Islamic bilingual boarding-school context reports challenges in sustaining Arabic use, including teacher language proficiency, student motivation, and reversion to Indonesian when Arabic is not closely monitored (Silviyanti et al., 2024). Thus, exposure to Arabic input alone may not ensure meaningful use. SP and OI are therefore urgent evaluation criteria for two reasons. SP asks whether the textbook anchors language in experiences and social contexts that learners can recognize, and OI asks whether learners receive explicit and graded support for the demanding morphology and syntax of Arabic (Cope & Kalantzis, 2016, 2023; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Ryding, 2005). When one is weak, learners may meet familiar contexts without the linguistic tools to act in them, or master forms without seeing why they matter.

The novelty of this study lies in examining *Al-'Arabiyyah li al-Nāsyi'in* as a pedagogical text through the full Multiliteracies Pedagogy framework rather than primarily through linguistic, cultural, curricular, or feasibility criteria. Previous studies have identified important characteristics of the textbook (Halim, 2020; Muzayanah et al., 2025; Roviin, 2018), while Arabic textbook research has applied other pedagogical frameworks to instructional content (Al-Qatawneh et al., 2021). Broader Multiliteracies Pedagogy research has addressed teacher professional development (Holloway, 2021; Loerts & Belcher, 2024; Maia, 2022), culturally responsive teaching (Kim et al., 2023), digital and multimodal literacy practices (Tour & Barnes, 2022; Yap & Gurney, 2023), phenomenon-based learning (Kangas & Rasi, 2021), and inclusive education (Papen & Gillen, 2024). Other studies have examined multiliteracies competencies through validated instruments and surveys (Andriyati et al., 2025; Karkar Esperat, 2023; Nabhan & Habók, 2025). Nevertheless, this literature has focused predominantly on classroom practices, teachers, learners, or digital environments rather than printed Arabic instructional materials. Where instructional materials have been analyzed, the results point to imbalances. Menke and Paesani (2019) found that text-based foreign-language materials emphasized the knowledge process of experiencing far more than conceptualizing,

analyzing, and applying, and Guo and Feng (2015) examined how visual resources in English textbooks construct knowledge. Comparable evidence for Arabic textbooks is scarce, and it rarely joins textual analysis with learners' own perceptions. Few studies have therefore examined an Arabic textbook through the combined lens of SP, OI, and student perception, and, to the authors' knowledge, none has done so for *Al-'Arabiyyah li al-Nāsyi'in*.

Accordingly, this study examines *Al-'Arabiyyah li al-Nāsyi'in* Volume III through Multiliteracies Pedagogy, focusing on SP and OI within the four-component framework (Cope & Kalantzis, 2013, 2016, 2023; The New London Group, 1996). SP concerns meaningful experiences, social contexts, personal realities, and available knowledge; OI concerns explicit explanation, guided practice, and scaffolding; Critical Framing (CF) concerns examination of texts and practices in relation to social, cultural, historical, ideological, and value dimensions; and Transformed Practice (TP) concerns applying, transferring, or redesigning knowledge in new contexts (The New London Group, 1996; Cope & Kalantzis, 2013, 2016, 2023). In this study, SP is identified through authentic everyday and Islamic contexts in texts and dialogues, role-play, and tasks that draw on learners' own experience. OI is identified through explicit presentation of grammatical patterns, modeled and graded drills, guided production, and organizing devices such as grammar syllabi. All four components are coded so that SP and OI can be interpreted within the textbook's overall pedagogical configuration, including what is absent from it. Learners' perceptions are then used to ask whether the features identified in the textbook are experienced as helpful by the students who use it.

The study employs a sequential mixed-methods design that combines qualitative content analysis of purposively sampled thematic units with quantitative data on students' perceptions of the textbook's pedagogical design, including differences across self-reported Arabic proficiency levels. The objectives are to map the representation of the four components, with particular attention to SP and OI; to describe how students perceive these components; and to examine where textual design and learner perception converge or diverge. The scope is limited to the selected units and framework-based pedagogical features; it does not measure classroom implementation in its entirety or causal effects on language achievement. Three research questions link the identified gap to the method and the findings: (1) How are the four components of Multiliteracies Pedagogy, particularly SP and OI, represented within the purposively sampled thematic units of the textbook? (2) How do students perceive the textbook's SP, OI, and related pedagogical features, and do these perceptions differ across self-reported Arabic proficiency levels? (3) To what extent do students' perceptions converge with or diverge from the pedagogical patterns identified in the textbook? Each question is answered in a corresponding part of the findings, and the three answers are brought together in the discussion.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

This study employed a sequential mixed-methods design in which qualitative content analysis of the textbook came first (Qual) and a quantitative survey of students' perceptions followed (Quan) (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017; Fetters et al., 2013). The design is not labeled explanatory sequential in the strict sense, because that design begins with quantitative data and uses a later qualitative phase to explain them (Fetters et al., 2013). Here the order is reversed: the textbook analysis identified how Multiliteracies Pedagogy is structurally represented, and the survey was then used to extend and contextualize those textual findings by asking whether learners experience the features that the analysis identified. The survey was therefore intended neither to validate the content analysis nor to replicate it, but to add the learner's side of the same pedagogical components.

Integration was planned at three levels (Fetters et al., 2013). At the design level, the sequence itself linked the strands. At the methods level, the strands were connected through a shared framework: the questionnaire items were written for the same components that were coded in the textbook, so that each component has a textual profile and a perception profile. At the interpretation and reporting level, the two profiles were placed side by side in a joint display (Table 8) and read for convergence, divergence, and extension.

Table 1
Sequential Mixed-Methods Research Design

Phase	Data source	Procedure and analysis	Role in integration
Qual	<i>Al-'Arabiyyah li al-Nāsyi'in</i> Volume III (15 of 29 units)	Unitizing, coding with a 16-indicator rubric, counting, and interpretation; inter-rater check (Cohen's κ)	Establishes the textual profile of each component
Quan	46 Grade 10 students; 10-item Likert questionnaire and two open-ended questions	Item and dimension descriptives; one-sample tests against the midpoint; Kruskal–Wallis test; thematic coding of open-ended answers	Adds the learner's perception profile of the same components
Integration	Both profiles	Joint display and comparison by component	Identifies convergence, divergence, and extension

Research Corpus and Participants

The qualitative object was *Al-'Arabiyyah li al-Nāsyi'in* Volume III by Mahmud Ismail Shini et al. Of its 29 thematic units (*wahdah*), 15 were purposively selected: Wahdah 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 16, 17, 19, 21, 23, 26, and 27. The selected units represented everyday-life, social, communicative, Islamic-cultural, and historical themes. They fall into five thematic groups: Islamic culture (Wahdah 10, 17, 21), home, school, and market (4, 8, 13), well-known places (11, 16, 23), discussion and survey topics (3, 7, 19), and Islamic figures (9, 26, 27). Each selected unit spans about seven pages, so the analysis covered every page of reading texts, dialogues, drills, and tasks in these units. The four review units (*murajaah*: Wahdah 6, 12, 18, and 24) were excluded because they introduce no new thematic or grammatical content. All pedagogical elements within the selected units were analyzed, including reading texts, dialogues, grammar exercises, and communicative activities.

The quantitative participants were 46 Grade 10 students at SMA Plus Muallimin Lembang, West Bandung Regency, West Java, who were using Volume III in Arabic learning. They were recruited through purposive sampling and grouped according to self-reported Arabic ability as Beginner ($n = 20$), Intermediate ($n = 24$), and More Proficient ($n = 2$). Respondents were recruited specifically from Grade 10; age was not recorded, but students at this level are typically about 15 to 16 years old. Their prior exposure to Arabic varied: some had studied Arabic previously at a *madrasah tsanawiyah* (MTs), while the majority had not studied it formally before entering the school, which is consistent with the wide spread of self-reported proficiency levels observed. The very small More Proficient group limits comparisons across levels, which is taken into account in the analysis and in the interpretation. Participation was voluntary, permission was obtained through the school by means of an official research permit letter and through the homeroom teacher, and the Google Form was distributed to students with no personally identifying information other than the self-reported proficiency level. All 46 questionnaires were complete, so no case was excluded and no missing value had to be handled. Respondents' names were not used in the analysis.

Instruments and Data Collection

For the qualitative strand, a content-analysis rubric was developed based on the operational indicators of Situated Practice, Overt Instruction, Critical Framing, and Transformed Practice as formulated by The New London Group (1996) and Cope & Kalantzis

(2016). The rubric contained 16 observable indicators across the four components. Illustrative indicators were authentic everyday or Islamic contexts in texts and dialogues, role-play, and personalized production tasks for SP; explicit presentation of a grammatical pattern with a model, graded oral and written drills, and guided production with vocabulary support for OI; tasks that ask learners to evaluate the purposes, values, or perspectives of a text for CF; and tasks in which learners apply or redesign knowledge in a new communicative situation for TP. The coding unit was a pedagogical element on a page (for example, a dialogue, a drill, or a task rubric), counted according to a unified protocol for each page type, and each counted element was assigned to one component. The rubric was theoretically validated through expert judgment by two Arabic-language education specialists and one critical-literacy specialist.

For the quantitative strand, a four-point Likert-scale questionnaire (1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly Agree) was developed by the researchers from the same four components and a multimodal design dimension. It contained 10 statement items, two for each of five dimensions: SP, OI, CF, TP, and multimodal design (Table 2). Two open-ended questions asked students which part of the book they liked most and which part they found most difficult, and why. The questionnaire was written in Indonesian; the items are translated here for reporting. The questionnaire was reviewed by the research supervisor, a specialist in Arabic language education, before administration.

Corrected item-total correlations ranged from .397 to .534, above the commonly used threshold of .30 for retaining an item (Boateng et al., 2018). Cronbach's alpha for the 10 items was .796, which indicates acceptable internal consistency for a short scale (Taber, 2018). Because each dimension has only two items, alpha is not interpreted at the dimension level, and dimension scores are treated as descriptive summaries. The questionnaire covered five dimensions, of which this article reports the SP and OI dimensions; the items of the remaining dimensions contributed to the overall reliability estimate and to the total perception score used in the group comparison.

Table 2
Questionnaire Structure and Items (Translated)

No	Dimension	Item
1	SP	The dialogues and reading texts discuss everyday situations that I recognize or have experienced myself (for example, Ramadan, school, family, Eid al-Adha).
2	SP	The book's themes (Islamic culture, school and home life, Islamic figures) are interesting and relevant to my interests and life experiences.
3	OI	The book introduces Arabic patterns gradually and gives clear examples, so I can easily understand new sentences.
4	OI	The vocabulary list and the explanation of how to use the student book help me learn.
5	CF	The "why" and "how" questions and the "What do you think?" section encourage me to think critically and express my own opinion.
6	CF	The texts about Islamic figures (for example, Salahuddin) let me analyze and evaluate the values they show.
7	TP	The writing and speaking exercises (<i>Tahaddath</i>) and guided expression (<i>Ta'bir Muwajjah</i>) encourage me to express my own ideas and understanding in Arabic.
8	TP	The review exercises at the end of each unit let me apply everything I have learned in an integrated way.
9	MM	The colored pictures and comics that accompany the dialogues and texts help me understand the lessons.
10	MM	The book design (colors, rubrics, and various exercise types) makes learning Arabic more interesting and less boring.

Note. SP = Situated Practice; OI = Overt Instruction; CF = Critical Framing; TP = Transformed Practice; MM = multimodal design.

The procedure followed the sequence of the design. The textbook units were first read and coded page by page. The questionnaire, together with the two open-ended questions, was

then administered to the 46 Grade 10 students as a Google Form distributed online, completed outside regular class hours rather than during lesson time, while the sampled units were still being used in ongoing Arabic instruction.

Data Analysis

The analysis followed five steps. First, qualitative data were analyzed through a thematic content-analysis procedure comprising three stages: (1) coding of text units containing SP, OI, CF, and TP indicators; (2) categorization of findings based on the established indicators; and (3) interpretation and conclusion drawing based on identified patterns (Krippendorff, 2018). Coding reliability was checked through an inter-rater procedure involving one independent coder, yielding a Cohen's kappa of $\kappa = .82$, which indicates almost perfect agreement (Landis & Koch, 1977; McHugh, 2012). Second, the coded instances were counted per component and expressed as percentages of all codable instances.

Third, the questionnaire data were summarized as item means, standard deviations, and the percentage of respondents who agreed (a response of 3 or 4). Dimension scores were computed as the mean of the two items of each dimension. Means were interpreted with four bands adopted for this study: 1.00 to 2.50 (low), 2.51 to 3.00 (moderate), 3.01 to 3.50 (high), and 3.51 to 4.00 (very high). Because a band is only a descriptive convention, claims about whether a dimension was rated favorably rest on one-sample tests against the scale midpoint of 2.5, with 95% confidence intervals and Cohen's d as an effect size. Likert responses are ordinal (Sullivan & Artino Jr, 2013), and the dimension scores departed from normality (Shapiro–Wilk $p < .01$ for all five dimensions), so the SPSS t -tests were complemented by Wilcoxon signed-rank tests as a robustness check.

Fourth, differences in the total perception score (computed across all ten items) across the three self-reported proficiency levels were tested with the Kruskal–Wallis test, which is appropriate for ordinal data and unequal group sizes, with epsilon squared (ϵ^2) reported as the effect size. The test has low power here because one group has only two students. The open-ended answers were coded by the researchers into categories of most-liked and most-difficult parts, and the number of respondents mentioning each category was counted; a response could fall into more than one category. All statistical procedures were performed using SPSS. Fifth, the two strands were integrated in a joint display that lists, for each component, the textual profile, the perception profile, and the relation between them (Fetters et al., 2013).

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Research Findings

In synopsis, and consistent with the focus of this article, the content analysis produced 345 codable instances in the 15 sampled units, with OI (51.6%) and SP (25.2%) together accounting for 76.8% of all instances; the remaining 23.2% (Transformed Practice, with no Critical Framing) lies outside this article's scope and is reported only in Table 3. Students' ratings of SP and OI mirrored this textual pattern only in part: SP was rated significantly above the scale midpoint ($M = 3.22$), OI was rated close to the midpoint ($M = 2.62$), and ratings did not differ across proficiency levels ($H = 1.784$, $p = .410$). Two findings are central to the study: strong contextual illustration and dialogue with limited Indonesian local context for SP, and strong grammar scaffolding with limited support for independent metalinguistic reflection for OI. The results describe this textbook and this sample; they do not establish claims about Arabic textbooks in general.

Representation of the Four Components (RQ1)

Table 3 shows how the 345 codable instances were distributed across the four components.

Table 3
Distribution of Codable Instances: Situated Practice and Overt Instruction (15 Units)

Component	Instances (n)	Percentage (%)
Overt Instruction (OI)	178	51.6
Situated Practice (SP)	87	25.2
Subtotal (SP + OI)	265	76.8
Other components (TP, CF; not analyzed further here)	80	23.2
Total codable instances	345	100.0

OI is the dominant component and SP is second; together they account for 76.8% of all codable instances, which supports the decision to concentrate this article on SP and OI rather than giving equal treatment to all four Multiliteracies Pedagogy components. The remaining instances (23.2%) belong to Transformed Practice, and no instance corresponds to Critical Framing; these two components are outside the scope of this article and are not analyzed or tabulated further. For transparency, the two units whose titles ask “What is your opinion?” (Wahdah 7 on homework and Wahdah 19 on pocket money) were confirmed as OI rather than Critical Framing, because the question form there serves as a sentence-pattern prompt for expressing opinions rather than an invitation to evaluate a text or a practice.

Situated Practice

Situated Practice appears mainly through everyday and Islamic themes, illustrated dialogues, role-play, and personalized speaking tasks (Table 4). Thematically, Volume III presents learning units centered on social and cultural life themes relevant to learners, such as school life, daily activities, social interaction, and aspects of family and community life. These themes are consistent with an orientation toward learners’ real-life contexts. The dialogues simulate authentic communicative situations, such as exchanges between students and teachers, between peers, and within social-environment interactions, and illustrations accompanying the texts provide visual support for the situational context. As an illustration of this recurring format, the opening dialogue of Wahdah 1 (*Ramadhan Mubarak*) presents a father and son preparing for the month of Ramadan, with references to the Fajr prayer, *suhur*, the *Tarawih* prayer, and a radio announcement. Wahdah 1 is not among the coded units; it is shown because it exemplifies the format.

An important SP feature is the rubric *Is’al bi-Nafsika* (اسأل بنفسك), which functions as a bridge between the text and the personal experience of learners by inviting them to simulate communication with an Arab interlocutor. The *Tamthil al-Masyhad* (تمثيل المشهد) rubric asks two students to enact the roles of the dialogue characters with physical props, and the *Tahaddath* (تحدث) rubric closes the oral practice sequence by asking learners to produce personalized utterances about their own preferences and experiences, for example where they prefer to spend Ramadan and why. These tasks position the learner’s own lifeworld as both the source and destination of language learning, in line with Cope and Kalantzis’s (2016) conception of SP as engagement with authentic social experience.

The limitation identified within SP is the lack of contextual variation reflecting Indonesian local realities. Most thematic contexts tend to be oriented toward Arab-Middle Eastern culture, which, although linguistically and Islamically relevant, does not fully reflect the lived experience of Indonesian learners. References to currency (*riyal*), cities (Mecca, Riyadh), and social customs may therefore need teacher mediation before they are situated for Indonesian learners.

Table 4
Situating Practice Features Identified in the Textbook

SP feature	Textbook element	Pedagogical function
Authentic everyday and Islamic context	Opening dialogue or illustrated reading text	Anchors language in situations learners recognize
Visual contextualization	Sequential illustrations accompanying texts	Supports meaning-making through image and text
Simulated communication	<i>Is 'al bi-Nafsika</i>	Links the text to learners' own experience
Role-play	<i>Tamthil al-Masyhad</i>	Moves from reading to situated performance
Personalized production	<i>Tahaddath</i>	Uses learners' preferences and experience as content

Overt Instruction

Overt Instruction is realized through the systematic and explicit presentation of grammar, summarized in Table 5. Each thematic unit includes a section presenting grammatical rules in a structured format, accompanied by illustrative examples and graded exercises that lead learners to build metalinguistic understanding progressively. The explanations follow a deductive pattern in which the rule is presented first, followed by examples and application exercises, and organized grammar tables, conjugation paradigms, and vocabulary lists provide cognitive scaffolding (Cope & Kalantzis, 2016; The New London Group, 1996).

Table 5
Representative Overt Instruction Instruments in the Textbook

Instrument	Form	Function
<i>Tadribat Musawwarah</i>	Illustrated drills with trigger words and a model	Modeled and cued application of a target structure
<i>Tadribat Shafawiyyah al-Nahw</i>	Structural display, model, and oral drills	Oral consolidation of one construction
<i>Tadribat Kitabiyyah</i>	Five graded written levels, including matching tables	Written consolidation and guided production
<i>Ta'bir Muwajjah, Talkhis Muwajjah</i>	Gap dialogue with word box; guided summary	Scaffolded movement toward autonomous production
<i>Khatt al-Riqa'ah, Muhfuzat</i>	Calligraphy copying; memorization	Script conventions and formulaic language
<i>Al-Tarakib al-Khabariyyah</i>	Syllabus of 98 constructions	Macro-level advance organizer

A particularly prominent OI instrument is *Tadribat Musawwarah* (تدريبات مصوّرة, illustrated drills) in *Dars 2*, in which six to twelve contextual images are each labeled with three trigger words. Students follow a Model–Training pattern in which an initial example demonstrates the target structure and later images require independent application. *Tadribat Shafawiyyah al-Nahw* (oral grammar exercises) in *Dars 3* then targets a construction introduced in the reading text through a structural display, a model example, and substitution, transformation, and production drills. The grammatical syllabus listing 98 syntactic constructions (*tarkib*) across the 29 units functions as an advance organizer (Ausubel, 1960) that shows teachers and students the grammatical trajectory of the volume.

The written dimension is realized through *Tadribat Kitabiyyah* (written exercises), which consolidates the oral patterns across five levels: pattern reproduction, substitution, transformation, gap-fill, and guided production. The matching table (*Jadwal Mula'amah*) on page 158 gives a three-column frame of subject, predicate, and object elements that students combine into sentences, which is structured yet partly open-ended. Guided expression (*Ta'bir*

Muwajjah), guided summary (*Talkhis Muwajjah*, no more than 45 words), and calligraphy (*Khatt al-Riqa'ah*) extend the sequence toward discourse-level and script conventions.

Nevertheless, learners' ability to reflect independently on language features is not optimally facilitated. Tasks that ask learners to analyze and describe grammatical function remain relatively limited. In addition, answer keys are available only in the teacher's edition, which limits self-correction, and explicit metalanguage terminology, such as case labels and clause types, is withheld from the student text. Both features are likely to increase dependency on teacher mediation.

Students' Perceptions (RQ2)

Because this article centers on SP and OI, the perception results reported and interpreted here are limited to the four items and two dimensions that correspond to these components (Table 6, Table 7); the questionnaire also included two items each for Critical Framing, Transformed Practice, and multimodal design, which were used only to compute the instrument's overall reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha = .796$) and the total perception score, and are not reported or discussed further.

Table 6
Item-Level Descriptive Statistics of Student Perceptions: SP and OI Items (N = 46)

Item	Dimension	M	SD	Agreement (%)
1	SP	3.54	0.59	95.7
2	SP	2.89	0.64	73.9
3	OI	2.63	0.71	58.7
4	OI	2.61	0.80	58.7

Note. Agreement = percentage of respondents who chose 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree). Item wording is given in Table 2.

Table 7
Dimension-Level Results and One-Sample Tests against the Scale Midpoint (2.5): SP and OI

Dimension	M	SD	t(45)	p	Mean difference [95% CI]	d	Band
SP	3.22	0.52	9.297	< .001	0.72 [0.56, 0.87]	1.37	High
OI	2.62	0.67	1.214	.231	0.12 [-0.08, 0.32]	0.18	Moderate

Note. d = Cohen's d (mean difference divided by SD). Wilcoxon signed-rank tests gave the same pattern: SP $p < .001$, OI $p = .196$.

SP was rated significantly above the midpoint ($M = 3.22$, $SD = 0.52$; $d = 1.37$), and its first item, on recognizable everyday situations in dialogues and texts, received the highest mean of all items ($M = 3.54$, 95.7% agreement). OI, in contrast, was rated close to the midpoint ($M = 2.62$, $SD = 0.67$; $p = .231$), with only 58.7% agreement on each of its two items. A Kruskal–Wallis test on the total perception score showed no significant difference across proficiency levels, $H(2) = 1.784$, $p = .410$, $\epsilon^2 = .04$, with mean ranks of 20.50 (Beginner), 25.77 (Intermediate), and 26.25 (More Proficient). Dimension-level tests were also not significant for SP ($H = 2.575$, $p = .276$, $\epsilon^2 = .06$) or OI ($H = 0.756$, $p = .685$, $\epsilon^2 = .02$). Because the More Proficient group has only two students, the absence of a significant difference should not be read as evidence that the levels are equivalent.

Thirty-four students answered the open-ended questions. Most often, students named the stories and reading texts as the part they liked most (18 responses), followed by illustrations (6), dialogues (3), and exercises (4). The most difficult parts were the exercises (15 responses), vocabulary and translation (10), the print and visual design, such as small type, inconsistent diacritics, and black-and-white pages (8), and comprehension of the reading texts (4). Several students linked the difficulty of the exercises to limited vocabulary or to unclear task instructions. Categories are not mutually exclusive.

Integrating the Two Strands (RQ3)

Table 8 brings the two profiles together for SP and OI, the components on which this article focuses. The strands converge for SP and diverge for OI, and this divergence is the informative result taken up in the discussion. Because textual frequency and perceived helpfulness are measured on different scales, convergence and divergence are interpreted here qualitatively, as consistency or inconsistency in direction between the two profiles, and not as a statistical comparison.

Table 8
Joint Display of Textbook Representation and Student Perceptions: SP and OI

Component	Textbook (content analysis)	Students (survey and open-ended answers)	Relation
SP	25.2% of instances; authentic dialogues, role-play, personalized production; limited Indonesian context	M = 3.22, significantly above midpoint; item 1 highest (M = 3.54); stories, illustrations, and dialogues liked most	Convergence; local context not measured by an item
OI	51.6% of instances; explicit patterns, graded drills, macro syllabus; no answer keys or metalanguage for students	M = 2.62, near midpoint; exercises, vocabulary, and translation named as hardest	Divergence: strong textual presence, modest perceived benefit

Note. TP and CF are outside the scope of this article (see Table 3) and are therefore not included in this joint display.

Discussion

Situated Practice: Convergence and the Question of Local Context

The convergence between the two strands is clearest for Situated Practice. The units combine everyday and Islamic themes, illustrated dialogues, role-play, and personalized speaking tasks, and students gave their highest rating to the item on dialogues and texts about recognizable situations and described stories, illustrations, and dialogues as the most appealing parts of the book. This is consistent with the principle that learning should be anchored in learners' social experience (Cope & Kalantzis, 2016; The New London Group, 1996). It also extends the observation of Menke and Paesani (2019) that materials tend to privilege experiencing (broadly corresponding to SP, with conceptualizing corresponding to OI, in the Learning by Design formulation; Cope & Kalantzis, 2016): in this textbook, experiencing is balanced by a larger volume of explicit instruction, so SP is a strength but not the dominant orientation.

The main qualification concerns what counts as situated. The contexts are Arab-Islamic, which are linguistically and religiously relevant for students in Islamic institutions but are not equivalent to Indonesian local realities. The questionnaire had no item on local-context representation, so this limitation rests on the content analysis alone and was not tested with students. Research on English textbooks shows that the treatment of local and international culture is a design choice with pedagogical consequences (Setyono & Widodo, 2019; Shin et al., 2011), and multiliteracies work on culturally responsive curricula argues for building on learners' own cultural resources (Kim et al., 2023). Whether adding Indonesian contexts would strengthen students' engagement with Arabic in pesantren and madrasah is an empirical question that this study cannot answer, but it identifies where teacher mediation has the most room to work.

Overt Instruction: Strong Presence, Modest Perceived Benefit

Overt Instruction is the most heavily represented component, which is consistent with the demands of Arabic morphology and syntax for non-native learners (Ryding, 2005) and with evidence that focused, explicit second-language instruction is effective (Norris & Ortega, 2000). The syllabus of constructions works as an advance organizer (Ausubel, 1960), and the

drills move from model to cued to guided production, which is the scaffolding that Multiliteracies Pedagogy associates with OI (Cope & Kalantzis, 2016).

Students' perceptions were less favorable than the textual weight of OI would suggest. The OI dimension did not differ from the midpoint, only 58.7% of students agreed with each OI item, and the open-ended answers located difficulty in exercises, vocabulary, and translation. Read together, the strands suggest that the presence of explicit instruction does not guarantee that learners experience it as helpful. When learners lack vocabulary, when task instructions are unclear, and when supporting resources such as vocabulary tables and clear diacritics are weak, explicit grammar teaching may not reach them. The content analysis points in the same direction: the absence of answer keys and of metalinguistic terminology in the student book suggests that the OI in this textbook is designed for teacher-led use more than for independent study. This is a divergence that a textbook analysis alone could not reveal, and it extends earlier materials analyses that establish what a textbook contains without asking how learners experience it (Menke & Paesani, 2019).

Implications for Textbook Adaptation, Teacher Mediation, and Indonesian Islamic Education

The findings carry implications for four audiences. For teachers in Indonesian madrasah and pesantren, they suggest supplementing the textbook with tasks that connect its themes to local experience, with vocabulary support for exercises, and with answer keys or self-checking routines. For textbook developers, they suggest adding reflective metalinguistic tasks and at least some Critical Framing and redesign tasks, and improving print quality and the consistency of diacritics, without giving up the authenticity of the Arabic. For teacher education, although the present data do not address teacher learning directly, research on multiliteracies teacher learning indicates that enacting the pedagogy depends on teachers' professional knowledge and sustained support (Holloway, 2021; Loerts & Belcher, 2024; Maia, 2022), and instruments now exist to describe teachers' multiliteracies practices (Andriyati et al., 2025; Nabhan & Habók, 2025). For institutions, the finding that the textbook's explicit design does not by itself secure a favorable learner experience echoes concerns that exposure to Arabic alone does not ensure meaningful use (Silviyanti et al., 2024).

The absence of a significant difference across proficiency levels is compatible with broadly similar perceptions within this sample, but the test had low power. The two students in the More Proficient group cannot support any conclusion about advanced learners, and the rising order of mean ranks (20.50, 25.77, 26.25) is only descriptive.

Limitations and Future Research

Several limitations should be considered. The sample comes from one school and is small, the questionnaire has only two items per dimension, and the perceptions are cross-sectional and self-reported. The sample was too small to examine the factor structure of the questionnaire, and its content validity rested on expert review by the research supervisor and was not quantified. The two OI items capture graduated presentation with examples and vocabulary and usage support rather than the full range of OI indicators coded in the textbook, and the items refer to the book as a whole rather than only to the 15 sampled units. The content analysis covers 15 of 29 units, and the finding that CF is absent is limited to those units and to the coding criteria used. The questionnaire did not include items on local-context representation or on independent metalinguistic reflection, so these two textual findings were not tested with students. Future research could analyze all four components across the whole series and across volumes, involve more institutions and larger groups of advanced learners, add items on local context and metalinguistic reflection, observe how teachers mediate the textbook in class, and test whether adapted materials change learners' experience.

CONCLUSION

This study mapped Situated Practice (SP) and Overt Instruction (OI) in *Al-'Arabiyyah li al-Nāsyi'in* Volume III, the two components on which this article is centered, and compared the textual profile with students' perceptions; Transformed Practice and Critical Framing were coded and reported only as background. OI dominated the coded instances (51.6%), and SP was second (25.2%). Students rated SP significantly above the scale midpoint, rated OI close to it, and did not differ by proficiency level. The contribution of the study is to show, for an Arabic textbook widely used in Indonesian Islamic institutions, that explicit grammar scaffolding and contextualized dialogues coexist with limited local context, no critical framing, and modest perceived benefit of explicit instruction, and that this can be seen only when textual analysis is joined with learner perception. The limitations are the small, single-school sample, the two-item dimensions, and the partial coverage of the textbook. Future research should extend the analysis to other volumes and institutions and observe classroom mediation. Practically, teachers and developers should add local contexts, vocabulary and feedback support, and critical and transformative tasks.

FUNDING

Researchers did not receive any funding for this research.

DECLARATION OF AI USE

During the preparation of this manuscript, the authors used Claude (Anthropic) for language editing and checking the consistency between the statistical output and the text. The authors reviewed and edited all content, verified all data and references, and take full responsibility for the final manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Aldahmash, A. H., & Alamri, N. M. (2020). An analysis of the inclusion of mathematical discourse components in arabic mathematical textbooks: The case of Saudi Arabia. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11*, 534803. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.534803>
- Al-Qatawneh, S. S., Alsalihi, N. R., Eltahir, Mohd. E., & Siddig, O. A. (2021). The representation of multiple intelligences in an intermediate Arabic-language textbook, and teachers' awareness of them in Jordanian schools. *Heliyon, 7*(5), e07004. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07004>
- Amgott, N. (2023). "The challenge was fun": Critical literacy and growth mindset in L2 multiliteracies. *System, 113*, 103000. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.103000>.
- Andriyati, N., Amin, A., & Li, Y. (2025). *Exploring multiliteracies competencies in Indonesian teacher education: A cross-disciplinary survey of pre-service teachers*. *Frontiers in Education, 10*, 1710081. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2025.1710081>.
- Ausubel, D. P. (1960). The use of advance organizers in the learning and retention of meaningful verbal material. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 51*(5), 267–272. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0046669>
- Boateng, G. O., Neilands, T. B., Frongillo, E. A., Melgar-Quinonez, H. R., & Young, S. L. (2018). Best practices for developing and validating scales for health, social, and behavioral research: A primer. *Frontiers in Public Health, 6*, 149. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2018.00149>
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2013). "Multiliteracies": New literacies, new learning. In *Framing languages and literacies* (pp. 105–135). Routledge.
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2016). *A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Learning by design*. Springer.
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2023). Towards education justice: The multiliteracies project revisited. In *Multiliteracies in international educational contexts* (pp. 1–33). Routledge.

- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Fetters, M. D., Curry, L. A., & Creswell, J. W. (2013). Achieving integration in mixed methods designs—Principles and practices. *Health Services Research*, 48(6pt2), 2134–2156. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.12117>
- Guo, N. S., & Feng, D. (2015). Infusing multiliteracies into English language curriculum: The visual construction of knowledge in English textbooks from an ontogenetic perspective. *Linguistics and Education*, 31, 115–129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2015.07.001>
- Halim, N. (2020). Analisis Teks Qiro'ah dalam Kitab Al Arobiyah Lin Naasiin Jilid 2 dalam Efektifitas Pembelajaran. *PALAPA*, 8(1), 113–128. <https://doi.org/10.36088/palapa.v8i1.701>
- Holloway, S. M. (2021). The multiliteracies project: Preservice and inservice teachers learning by design in diverse content areas. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 16(3), 307–325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1554480X.2020.1787172>
- Kangas, M., & Rasi, P. (2021). Phenomenon-Based learning of multiliteracy in a Finnish upper secondary school. *Media Practice and Education*, 22(4), 342–359. <https://doi.org/10.1080/25741136.2021.1977769>
- Karkar Esperat, T. M. (2023). The pedagogical content knowledge of a multiliteracies survey instrument for preservice teachers that meets the needs of diverse populations. *The Teacher Educator*, 58(4), 406–427. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2022.2147615>
- Kim, M. S., Meng, X., & Kim, M. (2023). Technology-enhanced multiliteracies teaching towards a culturally responsive curriculum: A multiliteracies approach to ECE. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 31(4), 1988–2000. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2020.1870503>
- Krippendorff, K. (2018). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*, 33(1), 159–174. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2529310>
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lim, F. V. (2023). Multiliteracies in Singapore English-Language Classrooms: Developing a Pedagogic Metalanguage for Multimodality. In *Multiliteracies in International Educational Contexts: Towards Education Justice* (pp. 139–154). Taylor and Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003349662-6>
- Loerts, T., & Belcher, C. (2024). Pedagogy in the context of multiliteracies: A longitudinal study of new educators. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, 47(1), 107–124. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44020-023-00052-4>
- Maia, A. A. D. M. (2022). English Language Teacher Education and the Multiliteracies Pedagogy: Constructing Complex Professional Knowledge and Identities. *RELC Journal*, 53(3), 657–671. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220954909>
- McHugh, M. L. (2012). Interrater reliability: The kappa statistic. *Biochemia Medica*, 22(3), 276–282. <https://doi.org/10.11613/BM.2012.031>
- Menke, M., & Paesani, K. (2019). Analysing foreign language instructional materials through the lens of the multiliteracies framework. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 32(1), 34–49. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2018.1461898>
- Mohamed, S. (2024). Text classification and gradation in Arabic textbooks. *The Language Learning Journal*, 52(6), 629–649. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2023.2213695>
- Muzayanah, A., Setiyawan, A., Mansur, N., & Putri, D. K. (2025). Analisis kitab Al-Arobiyah li An-Nasiy'in dalam pembelajaran mahārah qirā'ah di pondok pesantren.

- APHORISME: Journal of Arabic Language, Literature, and Education, 6(2), 583–600.
<https://doi.org/10.37680/aphorisme.v6i2.8813>
- Nabhan, S., & Habók, A. (2025). Development and validation of the Teacher Multiliteracies Scale (TMS) for English language teacher education. *System*, 131, 103673.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2025.103673>
- Norris, J. M., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 50(3), 417–528.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00136>
- Papen, U., & Gillen, J. (2024). Peer to Peer Deaf Multiliteracies: Experiential pedagogy, agency and inclusion in working with young adults in India. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 28(12), 2728–2749.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2022.2121433>
- Roviin, R. (2018). Analisis Buku Teks Al-'Arabiyyah li al-Nasyiin Karya Mahmud Ismail Shini, dkk. *Jurnal Al Bayan: Jurnal Jurusan Pendidikan Bahasa Arab*, 10(1), 36–53.
<https://doi.org/10.24042/albayan.v10i01.2594>
- Ryding, K. C. (2005). *A reference grammar of Modern Standard Arabic*. Cambridge University Press.
- Setyono, B., & Widodo, H. P. (2019). The representation of multicultural values in the Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture-Endorsed EFL textbook: A critical discourse analysis. *Intercultural Education*, 30(4), 383–397.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2019.1548102>
- Shin, J., Eslami, Z. R., & Chen, W.-C. (2011). Presentation of local and international culture in current international English-language teaching textbooks. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 24(3), 253–268. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2011.614694>
- Silviyanti, T. M., Yusuf, Y. Q., Samad, I. A., & Mukminin, A. (2024). The implementation of English and Arabic practices at an Islamic bilingual boarding school. *Jurnal Cakrawala Pendidikan*, 43(3), 630–644. <https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v43i3.72204>
- Sullivan, G. M., & Artino Jr, A. R. (2013). Analyzing and interpreting data from Likert-type scales. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*, 5(4), 541–542.
<https://doi.org/10.4300/JGME-5-4-18>
- Taber, K. S. (2018). The use of Cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education. *Research in Science Education*, 48(6), 1273–1296.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2>
- The New London Group. (1996). A Pedagogy of Multiliteracies: Designing Social Futures. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(1), 60–93.
<https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.66.1.17370n67v22j160u>
- Tour, E., & Barnes, M. (2022). Engaging English language learners in digital multimodal composing: Pre-service teachers' perspectives and experiences. *Language and Education*, 36(3), 243–258. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2021.1912083>
- Yap, J. R., & Gurney, L. (2023). Exploring practices of multiliteracies pedagogy through digital technologies: A narrative inquiry. *Literacy*, 57(3), 292–304.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/lit.12335>